UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE FEMALE QUIXOTE AND SAMUEL JOHNSON: A COMPUTER-ASSISTED ANALYSIS

BY

DEBORAH MCLEOD

©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Edmonton, Alberta
Fall 1991

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-70217-6

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Deborah McLeod

TITLE OF THESIS: The Female Quixote and Samuel Johnson: A Computer-Assisted Analysis

DEGREE: Master of Arts

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1991

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

D M McLeod

602G Michener Park
Edmonton, Alberta
T6H 5A1

October 10, 1991

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled THE FEMALE QUIXOTE AND SAMUEL JOHNSON: A COMPUTER-ASSISTED ANALYSIS submitted by DEBORAH MCLEOD in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS.

Isobel Grundy

Dr. Isobel Grundy

Dr. Stephen Reimer

Donald Bruce

Dr. Don Bruce

October 3, 1991

For

Heather, Jean and Laurie

I count myself in nothing else so happy
As in a soul remembering my good friends.

ABSTRACT

Since Reverend John Mitford first made the attribution in 1843, critics have generally agreed that Samuel Johnson wrote the penultimate chapter of The Female Quixote for Charlotte Lennox. While critics have argued that there is external evidence to support the attribution, the internal evidence has been considered decisive. This internal evidence, however, is often simply the critic's subjective impression that the chapter sounds like Johnson. In this paper the literary, historical and stylistic evidence for the attribution is examined. Emphasis is given to separating evidence that can be substantiated from that which is only speculative. It was discovered in a statistical comparison of the disputed chapter to texts known to be by each of the two authors that there are significant differences in the style of the chapter and the style of both Lennox and Johnson. The results suggest that the chapter may have been a collaborative effort. Until definite evidence to this effect is discovered, however, Lennox, rather than Johnson, must be assumed to be the author of the chapter.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Isobel Grundy for her guidance during the course of this project. Her enthusiasm for eighteenth-century matters is exceeded only by her kindness in twentieth-century ones. I would also like to thank Dr. Stephen Reimer for his comments on Chapter 4, the use of his LitStats program, and his patience under the assault of my endless questions.

Finally, I must thank my family--Jeremy, Aimée, Tobin and Ted--for the dishes washed, the meals cooked, and the endless cups of tea brought to the madwoman at the word processor. This project--or any other--would be impossible without their support. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER I: THE LIFE OF CHARLOTTE LENNOX 3

CHAPTER II: THE LENNOX-JOHNSON CONNECTION 18

CHAPTER III: THE DISPUTED CHAPTER 49

CHAPTER IV: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS 64

CONCLUSION 96

WORKS CONSULTED 99

LIST OF TABLES

Table IV-1: X^2 Values for Significant Vocabulary 85

Table IV-2: X^2 Values for Non-significant Vocabulary . . 86

Table IV-3: Comparison of Chapter Segments A and B . . . 89

Table IV-4: Comparison of Vocabulary in Chapter Segments and The Female Quixote Population. 92

Table IV-5: Comparison of Vocabulary in Chapter Segments and Rasselas Population. 92

INTRODUCTION

In 1843, nearly a hundred years after the publication of The Female Quixote; or, The Adventures of Arabella (1752), Reverend John Mitford attributed its penultimate chapter to Samuel Johnson. Though Mitford offered some external evidence, he considered the internal evidence to be decisive; the style, he argued, was unmistakably Johnsonian.

This particular authorship puzzle has never been completely resolved. It has remained a problem, but hardly one sparking passionate debate. By and large, critics have believed, like Mitford, that Johnson wrote the chapter for Charlotte Lennox, and, again like Mitford, they have largely based their belief on internal evidence: when all is said and done, the chapter just sounds like Johnson.

In this thesis I have taken a close look at the evidence for and against this attribution--not with the expectation that I would solve a problem that has puzzled scholars for over a hundred years (although that would have been extremely gratifying)--but with the hope that I would learn something about the process of authorial attribution.

The external evidence in this debate is generally based upon Lennox's character and her friendship with Johnson; I therefore begin with a short biography of Lennox and a discussion of their relationship. This is followed with a history of the authorship problem. Throughout, my focus is

to separate what can be supported, and thus considered evidence, from what must be considered only speculation.

Finally, I attempt to assess the internal evidence by a statistical analysis of style. After choosing several stylistic features, I compare the chapter first with work known to be by Lennox and then with work known to be by Johnson. Statistical analysis in authorship questions is certainly not new, but this type of study is becoming more practical as access to the necessary computers and suitable software programs increases. This authorship problem gave me an opportunity to explore current methodologies as well as some of the available technology.

The most challenging aspect of this study was to imaginatively reconstruct Charlotte Lennox's world. Given the time period, the fact that Lennox and Johnson were close friends, and Johnson's literary stature in our own time, it is difficult not to construct Johnson's world and place Lennox in it in relation to him. Lennox, however, did not merely exist as an extension of Johnson. In the following study I consider the disputed chapter in terms of either Lennox or Johnson. It is important to keep in mind, however, that other solutions are possible. Johnson was not Lennox's only friend, nor is he the only reason we should find her interesting.

CHAPTER I: THE LIFE OF CHARLOTTE LENNOX

When Charlotte Lennox died on January 4, 1804, she was old, tired and alone in the world. The friends who had assisted her professionally and personally--friends that included some of the greatest men of the age--had all died or deserted her. Her family were either dead or uncaring: she had been separated from her husband, Alexander, for several years; her daughter, Harriet, had died at least twenty years previously;[1] and there is no record that her son, George, who had fled to America to escape difficulties in England, ever offered to help his mother or even told her where he was. Lennox published her last piece of literary work in 1790; from that point her financial situation became increasingly desperate. In January of 1802, Lady Frances Chambers, in an act of charity, wrote to the Reverend Dr. Williams, founder of the Literary Fund, seeking

> any small sums of half guineas or less for the immediate relief of Mrs. Charlotte Lennox who is in great distress for the common necessaries of life and is too ill, and now too old to be able to assist herself in any way--she has not been able to go out of her lodging this three months. . . . Mrs. Lennox . . . has not any relations or friends who seem to think that she has claims on them--

> indeed I believe she has lost in her daughter the only friend she had a claim upon. (qtd. in Small 60-61)

As the "Memoir of Charlotte Lennox" in the June 1813 issue of The Lady's Monthly Museum notes, this is not the expected end of a author who has earned the respect and admiration of both the public and her peers:

> The patronage she [Charlotte Lennox] received from writers of established celebrity, combined with the encouragement she met with from a discerning public, ought to have secured her a decent competence; but this, from some cause or other, was not the case. The latter part of her life was clouded by sickness and penury, and her chief support was derived from the Literary Fund. (315)

Initially this Society assisted her with a number of small sums, including thirteen guineas for her son's passage to America in 1793. Finally in 1803 they granted her a tiny weekly allowance which continued until her death the following year. According to The National Cyclopedia of American Biography, The Right Honourable George Rue paid the expenses of her burial, but no one arranged for a monument to mark the grave; instead, she "lies buried with the common soldiery in the further burying-ground of Broad Chapel, undistinguished even by a headstone to say where she lies" (Nichols, qtd. in Small 63).

The beginning of Charlotte Lennox's life was as obscure as the end was pathetic. We can be certain about very little of her early biography. Although there are several versions of the "facts" of her life (two of which are discussed below), the account that was generally accepted up until the publication of Miriam Small's biography, Charlotte Ramsay Lennox: An Eighteenth Century Lady of Letters (1935), is that given in the Gentleman's Magazine obituary of January 1804. It states that her father, James Ramsay,

> was a field-officer, lieutenant-governor of New York, who sent her over at 15 to a wealthy aunt, who desired to have her, but who, unfortunately, on the arrival of her niece, was out of her senses, and never recovered them; immediately after which, the father died, and the daughter from that time supported herself by her literary talents, which she always employed usefully. (89-90)

A slight variation, found in the National Cyclopedia of American Biography (1896), has the young Charlotte sent overseas to complete her education after the death of her mother. Her father dying during her voyage, she was left without friends in England: "Left thus without a protector, Lady Rockingham took her up, receiving her into her household; but an obscure love affair ended the friendship, and the Duchess of Newcastle became her patroness" (6: 51).

There is one other account of Lennox's background that is worth mentioning. Neither Miriam Small nor Philippe Séjourné seem to have been aware of this source, although Gae Brack discusses it in her unpublished dissertation, "Samuel Johnson and Four Literary Women." The Edinburgh Weekly Magazine of October 9, 1783, printed an article entitled "Memoirs of Mrs Lenox, the celebrated Author of the Female Quixotte, and other works" that offers very complete and specific information about Charlotte Lennox. Since it was published eleven years before her death, Lennox herself may be the source of the information. According to this article Charlotte Lennox could trace her lineage to "the noble and ancient house of Dalhousie in Scotland" (33). Her paternal grandfather was a soldier, and her maternal grandmother was a Lumley, of the Scarborough family. Her father, James Ramsay, the youngest of three sons, married the "sister . . . [of] the Reverend Dr Tisdale of Ireland, the friend and companion of the celebrated Dean Swift" (33). James Ramsay, a soldier like his father, "commanded a company at the siege of Gibraltar in the year 1731" (33). The Ramsays had three children while they were stationed in Gibraltar; Charlotte was the youngest and the only one to survive. The family returned to England, remained there for several years, then left for New York, where Charlotte's father "was second in military command to the governor" (34). There he died two years after assuming his post.

After his death, Mrs. Ramsay decided to send the fourteen-year-old Charlotte to stay with her maternal aunt, Mrs. Lucking of Messing Hall. Unfortunately, upon her arrival, Charlotte discovered that her aunt had died, having lost her senses after the death of her only son. Charlotte's friends were preparing to send her home when "in the mean time, some of her little compositions being handed about, they drew upon her the notice of several persons of distinction," Lady Isabella Finch and her sister, the Dowager Marchioness of Rockingham (34). This connection, however, was dissolved when she married Alexander Lennox, "a young gentleman of good family and genteel education, but whose fortune . . . consisted wholly in hopes and expectations" (34). The rest of the article is composed of a discussion of Lennox's works and an encomium to the genius of her son, George Louis.

Whether Lennox offered this information about her early life or simply allowed it to be propagated, there is no doubt that a good deal of it simply is not true. Charlotte Lennox certainly spent time in America; her accurate descriptions of the area and people in The Life of Harriot Stuart (1750) and Euphemia (1790) prove she had personal experience in the area around New York and Albany. But Miriam Small has pointed out a number of discrepancies in the details of her early biography, chief of which is the impossibility that her father was either the Royal Governor

or the Lieutenant-Governor of New York as she claimed, since his name appears neither in the civil lists nor any of the local histories of this period. He was most likely an officer of lower rank.[2] The date of Charlotte Lennox's birth is also a source of difficulty. In a letter written in 1753 Samuel Richardson refers to Lennox as being "hardly twenty-four" (qtd. in Small 15). This would place her date of birth much closer to 1730 than 1720. The birth-dates of Lennox's children (1765 and 1771) make this later date seem more probable (Doody xi). Small, however, maintains that Richardson was plainly mistaken; since The Female Quixote was written when she was thirty-two, Lennox must have been born in 1720 (15). Scholars since Small tend to use the later date or simply, like Margaret Doody, give a range of 1720-1730 (xi).

The details of Lennox's life in England are also difficult to confirm. In 1747 Charlotte Lennox published her first work, Poems on Several Occasions, a collection of poetry which she dedicated to Lady Isabella Finch, Lady Rockingham's sister. In this same year she married Alexander Lennox. They would eventually have two children, Harriet Holles, born in 1765, and George Louis, born in 1771.[3] Marrying Alexander Lennox assured Charlotte of neither financial security nor personal happiness. According to Mrs. Lennox, Alexander not only failed to

support his family, he was "a most unnatural father" who led his son to "the brink of utter ruin" (qtd. in Small 59).

At some point in the two years prior to her first novel, The Life of Harriot Stuart, Lennox worked as an actress, apparently with little success. The only record of her stage career is found in a letter written by Horace Walpole to George Montagu on September 3, 1748. He refers to a play in which he saw "a Miss Charlotte Ramsay, a poetess, and deplorable actress" (2: 337).

Fortunately, Lennox was more successful with her writing. The publication of The Life of Harriot Stuart in 1750 marks the beginning of a literary output that is remarkable both for its range as well as its volume. Faced with constant financial distress, Lennox tried her hand at any kind of writing that appeared likely to receive monetary reward. Besides the book of poetry previously mentioned, she wrote five novels: (Harriot Stuart (1747), The Female Quixote (1752), Henrietta (1758), Sophia (1762), and Euphemia (1790)); a translation and critical appraisal of Shakespeare's sources (Shakespear Illustrated (1753-4)); a pastoral drama (Philander (1757)); two plays (The Sister (1769) and Old City Manners (1775)); and eight translations, including the Memoirs of Maximilian de Bethune, Duke of Sully (1755) and The Greek Theatre of Father Brumoy (1760). In addition to this work she also wrote for and most likely managed The Lady's Museum (1760-1761). Throughout her life

Lennox attempted to have work published by subscription. Although she was never successful, the preparation and promotion of the required proposals also took a good deal of time and effort.[4]

Charlotte Lennox was assisted in her literary efforts by a number of the great men of her day, including Samuel Johnson, Samuel Richardson, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Oliver Goldsmith and David Garrick. She also received assistance from many of the lesser literary lights. In her translation of Pierre Brumoy's Théâtre des Grecs, for example, Lennox was assisted by Dr. Gregory Sharpe, Dr. Grainger, John Bourrya, Lord Orrery, and Dr. Johnson (Hazen 91). Lennox was especially helped throughout her career by Samuel Johnson, whose assistance is discussed separately, and Lord Orrery, who Johnson introduced to her. Many others, including Henry Fielding, admired her work and were personal acquaintances (Small 14). The degree to which she was respected as a literary figure in her time is indicated by her inclusion as one of the nine living Muses of Great Britain in an engraving included in the Ladies' Pocket-Book of 1778 (Small 48).

This admiration, however, was not universal. Lennox was not welcomed into the Bluestocking set and her name is surprisingly absent from the social accounts of the time. Charlotte Lennox, indeed, has a reputation of being disliked or merely tolerated by other women. Frances Burney reported

in her Diary that "Mrs. Thrale says that though Mrs. Lennox's books are generally approved, nobody likes her" (1: 91). Miss Hawkins found her slovenly, eccentric, ignorant, physically aggressive, and generally worthless (Isles 1971, 175n). The fact that she seemed to attract, perhaps more than any other author of her time, the assistance and friendship of so many of the great men of the age, while at the same time being seemingly rejected by her own sex, has interested her biographers. Both Duncan Isles and Gustavus Maynadier place the blame on Charlotte Lennox: Isles sees the discrepancy as a function of her personality, Maynadier as a result of a fault in her character.

Duncan Isles perceives Lennox as being cursed with an "unfortunate personality"; she was unlikeable, argumentive and petulant. He concludes that

> When we examine what is known of Mrs. Lennox's personality any suspicion that Johnson gave her literary help for the sake of the pleasure of her company must be considerably diminished, whereas our admiration of Johnson's tolerance and forbearance is correspondingly increased. . . . [M]ost of the surviving evidence reveals Mrs. Lennox as a woman remarkably difficult to get on with . . . she had an exceptionally quick temper, was quarrelsome and impatient, outspoken to the point of rudeness and (above all) bitterly

resentful of any criticism of her work that had not been solicited. . . . (1967: 39)

Gustavus Howard Maynadier in The First American Novelist? (1940) argues--not that Lennox was unlikeable--but that she somehow masked an unsavoury background and a deceitful nature with physical charm. That charm made her "more a man's than a woman's woman" (51), the implication being that other women, being unaffected by her charm, sensed her true character.

Maynadier is sure that Lennox had American relatives that she deliberately kept secret. He worries that Lennox prevaricated, hiding her background because her relatives were not quite respectable or "in a position to make her anxious to acknowledge them" (76). Maynadier moves from these conjectures about Lennox's past to speculation about her morals and her personality. He casts doubt on her character by suggestion; he is surprised, for example, that "no one who has written of her has ever mentioned as at all singular" the fact that Lennox did not have children until she had been married seventeen-and-a half years (54). He suggests that Johnson, who "was a good deal of a philanderer," was attracted to her for more than her literary talents (51). He bases the latter innuendo on two "arguments." First, he considers it significant that only two women were present at the party Johnson gave for Lennox to celebrate her first novel. His second point, which

carries the burden of his argument, is grounded on his reading of Charlotte Lennox's character based on her portrait by Sir Joshua Reynolds. According to Maynadier, this picture

> shows her a lady of considerable beauty, not lacking in character, with an alert expression suggestive of a sly, perhaps roguish sense of humor, one might say a little arch. She might very well be interesting to talk to. (51).

This "sly" expression, coupled with the lack of information about her background in America, seems to suggest all sorts of unsavoury possibilities to Maynadier:

> nobody has ever suggested that Mrs. Lennox was an adventuress, and evidence points to the contrary. There is something sly, though, in the expression that Sir Joshua gave her. There is meaning in that concise statement in the notice in Chalmer's Biographical Dictionary only eleven years after her death--"very little is known of her early history by her few surviving friends." (77)

Isles and Maynadier expound the two most common explanations for the fact that Mrs. Lennox had more male than female friends: either there was something wrong with her personality or she was "more a man's than a woman's woman"--and that fact somehow reflected on her character (Maynadier

51). Both explanations ignore some important and fairly obvious points.

Lennox's absence in the social records of the time could simply be an indication of her lack of time and money. We know that she was in constant financial distress; perhaps she simply did not have the money to return social obligations (Small 48). She likely did not have the time either; writing, translating and dealing with the pragmatic aspects of publication must have claimed the bulk of her day. Lennox's responsibilities would have increased with the birth of her children, adding household and parental obligations as well as increasing her financial burden. The fact that her household was often disordered--there was a "want of all order and method" according to the meticulous Miss Hawkins--was more likely an indication of busyness than evidence of a dissolute character (qtd. in Small 47). The difficulties of providing for a family no doubt strained Charlotte Lennox's patience; really, is it any wonder if she was often difficult to get on with?

Lennox's critics also seem to forget that she was one of the very first professional female writers, and that she was forced into that profession against her inclinations. This may be one of the reasons that she was unacceptable to the Bluestocking circle; as a professional author, frankly and openly writing for financial gain, she may not have met their standards of intellectual purity. She may well have

found that she had more in common with men like Samuel Johnson who had experienced similar pressures and difficulties.

I have discussed Maynadier's analysis of Charlotte Lennox's character in some detail to illustrate the power that conjecture and supposition have had in our understanding of her life and works. The burden of proof falls upon Lennox or her apologists rather than her critics; if one cannot positively establish her early history, then there must be a shameful secret; if she was not universally well-liked, there must be something wrong with her. Maynadier moves in an obviously illogical and unfair fashion from his subjective impression of Lennox's smile to a suggestion that her character was faulty: she was somehow "sly" and deceitful. He takes a simple statement that little is known of her early history and insinuates that there is a terrible or shameful secret in her past. Charlotte Lennox may have been sly and she may well have hidden an embarrassing family, but suggestions of dark family secrets that are put forward without any more proof than Maynadier's subjective impression of her smile constitute gossip rather than scholarship.

Likewise, Isles's negative analysis of Lennox's personality and his assumption that Johnson gained little by her friendship, although perhaps not without factual basis, ignores a good deal of information. Isles ignores the fact

that Samuel Johnson was the greatest, but not the only, literary figure to take an interest in Lennox's career. Although it is likely that many of the men who helped Charlotte Lennox did so initially at Johnson's request, they need not have continued to assist her. Isles underestimates the power of Lennox's attractive qualities: her energy, perseverance, courage and talent.

My defense of Lennox's character, however, is as speculative and potentially fallacious as Maynadier's and Isles's negative assessment of it. We do not assess a man's career, after all, according to our reconstruction of his character. The question at issue here is not whether Charlotte Lennox was nice, but whether she was talented.

Notes

1. Harriet Holles died in either 1782 or 1783 (Gae Brack 186n).

2. Miriam Small discovered a James Ramsay mentioned in the accounts of the period who served as an officer in Lt. General Bissett's Regiment of Foot. This soldier was made First Lieutenant on August 26, 1736. He was then promoted to Captain in December of 1738 in one of the four Independent Companies of Invalids stationed at New York. (Small 2-3)

3. By some accounts Charlotte Lennox had three children, two sons and a daughter, with one son dying in infancy ("Memoirs of Mrs Lenox," The Edinburgh Weekly Magazine 9 Oct. 1783: 36).

4. Lennox may also have written The History of Eliza (1767) but this has never been established.

CHAPTER II: THE LENNOX-JOHNSON CONNECTION

Just as our perception of Charlotte Lennox's personality and life is coloured by critical conjecture and supposition, so too is our understanding of her relationship with Samuel Johnson. Because Johnson dwarfs the literary landscape of this period, it is difficult to find a proper perspective from which to view a figure of less stature such as Lennox. Almost invariably, every literary event in her life is perceived in terms of a possible connection with Johnson; it has been suggested that Johnson may have, could have, possibly did assist, advise, write, suggest, encourage or promote almost every piece of literature Lennox produced. Establishing the connections between the two authors involves a seemingly endless sifting of fact and conjecture. In this chapter I have attempted to sort out what can be confirmed, or at least partially substantiated, from what must be considered mere suggestion or wishful thinking--filtering the known out from the merely possible.

We know that the friendship between Charlotte Lennox and Samuel Johnson stretched over at least thirty-four years. It is generally believed that Lennox met Johnson through her husband, Alexander, who worked for William Strahan, the London printer. Both Strahan and his partner, Andrew Millar, were friends of Johnson's (Small 7). A second possibility is that she was introduced to Johnson by

her first publisher, Samuel Paterson, who was also one of Johnson's circle of acquaintances.[1] Although we do not know exactly when Johnson and Lennox met, the party Johnson arranged to celebrate Lennox's first novel, The Life of Harriot Stuart; Written by Herself, indicates that they were on good terms before its publication in 1751. This is supported by a reference to "our Charlotte's Book" which Johnson made in a letter written in December of the same year (Johnson, Letters #36 1: 39). Johnson and Lennox remained friends until the final years of Johnson's life; on March 18, 1782--two years before his death--Johnson wrote in his diary: "Of the next day [Sat. March 16, 1782] I remember nothing but that I rose in the afternoon and saw Mrs. Lennox . . ." (qtd. in Hawkins 1: 102).

We also know that Johnson thought very highly of the abilities of his younger friend. On July 10, 1781, he wrote to Donald S. Tuttle asking him to assist Lennox, who "is in great distress; very harshly treated by her husband, and oppressed with severe illness." According to Johnson, Tuttle has the opportunity to help a "Great genius"; he has "perhaps never [been] called to the relief of a more powerful mind" (Johnson, Letters #736.1 2: 431). Johnson also allegedly said of Lennox that "Mrs Lenox writes as well as if she could do nothing else, and does every thing else as well as if she could not write" ("Memories" 33).[2] Finally, in the well-known and often-quoted passage from the

Life of Johnson Boswell records Johnson's preference for Lennox over three more famous women:

> On the evening of Saturday, May 15, [1784] he was in fine spirits, at our Essex-Head Club. He told us, "I dined yesterday at Mrs. Garrick's, with Mrs. Carter, Miss Hannah More, and Miss Burney. Three such women are not to be found: I know not where I could find a fourth, except Mrs. Lennox, who is superiour to them all."[3] (Boswell 4: 275)

The incident is corroborated in Bowles's manuscript of some "memorandums" of Johnson's conversation at Heale. He reports that Johnson "spoke with great regard" of Miss Hannah More, Miss Burney and Mrs. Lennox, "but seemed to prefer Mrs. Lennox."[4]

The first recorded act of friendship between Charlotte Lennox and Samuel Johnson--and apparently the first act of patronage on his part--is the celebration of Lennox's first novel, The Life of Harriot Stuart. According to Sir John Hawkins,

> Mrs. Lenox, a lady now well known in the literary world, had written a novel intitled "The life of Harriot Stuart," which in the spring of 1751 was ready for publication. One evening at the club, Johnson proposed to us the celebrating the birth of Mrs. Lenox's first literary child, as he called her book, by a whole night spent in festivity

. . . The place appointed was the Devil tavern, and there, about the hour of eight, Mrs. Lenox and her husband, and a lady of her acquaintance, now living, as also the [Ivy Lane] club, and friends to the number of near twenty, assembled. Our supper was elegant, and Johnson had directed that a magnificent hot apple-pye should make a part of it, and this he would have stuck with bay-leaves, because, forsooth, Mrs. Lenox was an authoress, and had written verses; and further, he had prepared for her a crown of laurel, with which, but not till he had invoked the muses by some ceremonies of his own invention, he encircled her brows. The night passed, as must be imagined, in pleasant conversation, and harmless mirth, intermingled at different periods with the refreshments of coffee and tea. About five, Johnson's face shone with meridian splendour, though his drink had been only lemonade; but the far greater part of us had deserted the colours of Bacchus, and were with difficulty rallied to partake of a second refreshment of coffee, which was scarcely ended when the day began to dawn. This phenomenon began to put us in mind of our reckoning; but the waiters were all so overcome with sleep, that it was two hours before we could

get a bill, and it was not till near eight that the creaking of the street-door gave the signal for our departure. (Hawkins 285)[5]

The personal and professional regard that motivated such an elaborate celebration is also revealed in the surviving correspondence of Johnson and Lennox. The relationship that emerges is not one of distant patron and hopeful protégée (although no doubt that was part of their connection), but of old and comfortable friends. In a letter written in 1777, for example, Charlotte Lennox tempts Johnson to visit her at her cottage with offers of home-cooking:

> You cannot imagine the pleasure it gave me to hear you say you would come and eat apple dumplings of my making. You may be sure I will hold you to your promise, but alas! apples will not be ripe this long time, and I am impatient for your company. Suppose you were to try my hand at a gooseberry tart--if I might venture to say it without being thought vain, I could tell you that my tarts have been admired--indeed you will make me very happy by naming a day for another visit to my cottage. . . . (qtd. in Small 50)

The warmth of their friendship is further illustrated by three letters which indicate that Johnson valued the relationship enough to take the initiative in repairing

their differences. In one undated note he is clearly very annoyed with Lennox and the tone she has taken in her last letter; he chastises her stiffly, and advises her to

> resolve to use any method of transacting with your friends but that of letters. You will, in whatever part of the World you may be placed, find mankind extremely impatient of such letters as you are inclined to favour them with. You can send your letters, such as the last but one, <any> only to two sorts of people, those whom you cannot pain, and those whom you can, and surely it is not elegible either to give mirth to your enemies or to raise anger in your friends. ("Lennox Connection" #44, 419)[6]

Even though Johnson appears to be the injured party in this dispute--Lennox apparently has misunderstood and resented a request that he has made of her--Johnson concludes with the hope that they can continue as friends:

> I have no inclination to continue quarrels, and therefore hope y[ou wi]ll again allow me, now I have vented my resentm[ent] [,to be,?]
>
> Dear Madam, [your] most obedient and most humble [servant] . . . .
>
> ("LC" #44, 419; bracketed portions indicate Isles's tentative reconstruction of the damaged MS)

His desire to preserve their friendship is evident in another letter that Isles tentatively dates as written in January, 1782. In this note Johnson apologizes for his behaviour during Lennox's recent visit:

> That mistake may not gather strength by time, I make this haste to assure you, that between hurry and sickness joined with other causes of confusion, I did not on yesterday morning know either your Face or your Voice, and that the answer which I happened to give you was intended for another, very unlike you, so that you must not be angry with,
>
> Madam, Your humble Servant
>
> Sam: Johnson
>
> ("LC" #35, 178-79)

In a third letter, this one written after a serious quarrel, Johnson's primary concern is the survival of the relationship rather than the apportionment of blame. This letter is worth reproducing in full both as an indication of the value Johnson placed on their friendship and as an illustration of its warmth; the tone of this note is as affectionate as it is conciliatory:

> Dear Madam
>
> When friends fall out the first thing to be considered is how to fall in again, and he is the

best that makes the first advances, I have designed to come to you ever since half an hour after you ran from me but I knew not whither. I did not when I began intend to say more [than] the first sentence, nor when I left off, to have a final quarrel. Pray, my dear, think no more of it, but come to me or let me know when I can come to you, for the thought of driving you away will be very painful to,

Dearest Partlet, Your most obedient &c

Sam: Johnson

Thursday night

I have not read your Letter nor will read it, till I know whether it is peevish or no, for if it be you shall have it again. ("LC" #45, 419-20)

Like the teasing "Dearest Partlet" reference above, the playful tone of a letter Johnson wrote to Lennox shortly after the publication of Shakespear Illustrated (1753-54) indicates his affection for her: "I hope you take care to observe the Doctor's prescriptions, and take your physick regularly, for I shall soon come to enquire. I should be sorry to lose Criticism in her bloom . . ." ("LC" #11, 38).[7]

As discussed above, the warmth of the connection between Lennox and Johnson is indicated by the tone of their correspondence and his interest in maintaining their

relationship. Their closeness is also revealed in the sundry minor details that can be gleaned from their letters. Johnson, for example, was on such terms with the Lennox family that he borrowed several small sums from Alexander Lennox ("LC" #43), and Mrs. Lennox felt free to seek Johnson's advice about family affairs. When she wrote requesting his assistance in finding translation work and a position for her husband in February of 1752 (Brack 73), Johnson responded immediately, assuring her of his efforts and expressing his concern for her well-being ("LC" #6, 341-42). As well, Lennox consulted him between 1775 and 1780 about the education of her daughter, Harriet ("LC" #48). She turned to him again in June 1780 when the same daughter was injured in an accident. In a letter to Mrs. Thrale Johnson writes that "Mrs.-- [identified as Lennox by Hester Lynch Piozzi] has just been with me to get a chirurgeon to her daughter . . . who has received a kick from a horse, that has broken five fore-teeth on the upper side" (The Letters of Samuel Johnson, #684 2: 376). A reference to Harriet's schooling in this same letter indicates Johnson's familiarity with Lennox's domestic concerns. Finally, quite remarkable evidence of his affection and high regard is found in Johnson's letter of Thursday, March 12, 1752. Even though Johnson is "very much dejected" because of his wife's ill health--she is, in fact, dying and will live only another five days--he finds the time and energy to write

her, passing on a compliment from Millar and wishing her "kind present" (probably a copy of The Female Quixote) "the Success which it deserves" ("LC" #7, 343).

Their correspondence also confirms Johnson's interest and involvement in Lennox's literary affairs. In addition to suggesting translation projects (the Histoire des Conjurations by P. Tetre, for example)[1], he comforts and encourages her when she is upset by the unfavourable reviews of The Memoirs of the Countess of Berci: "if you were not too proud already," he writes, "I would tell you, that you are now got above their malice, and . . . have such a degree of reputation as will secure you from any neglect of readers or Stationers" ("LC" #15). He offers her advice on the art of subscription when she is attempting to launch a collection of her work:

> Your subscription can hardly fail of success, but you must wait its progress. By telling your friends how much you expect from them you discourage them, for they finding themselves unequal to your expectation, will rather do nothing and be quiet, than do their utmost, and yet not please. ("LC" #31, 173-76)

In addition to counselling her on literary matters, Johnson occasionally acted as a mediator between Lennox and her publishers. In an undated letter Johnson promises Lennox to "speak to Mr. Payne and to Mr. Cave" in order to turn "the

whole affair" to her advantage ("LC" #1, 334).[9] Johnson's involvement as a negotiator in Lennox's business affairs is corroborated by a letter believed to have been written in 1778. Lennox writes that "a hundred and fifty Copies will be sufficient" and thanks Johnson for "so kindly undertaking to manage this little affair." She then urges him to "begin to treat with Mr Strahan" as quickly as possible, before she is "quite forgot" (#26 Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 57). J. D. Wright has suggested that this may refer to a reprinting of Sully's Memoirs.

Letters that Lennox wrote to Johnson in 1777 and 1778 reveal that he assisted her in the resolution of a copyright dispute she was involved in with James Dodsley and his partners. In her letter of June 17, 1777, Lennox asks Johnson to introduce her to a "gentleman of the law":

> Mr. Lennox is so desirous of recovering his property out of the hands of the booksellers, that he gives me leave to take any measures that shall be judged proper--it will be necessary to have the advice of some gentleman of the law, I am not known to Mr. Murphy, but if you will be so good to mention my affairs to him, and let me know where he lives, I will call upon him. (qtd. in Bloom, 230-31)

The "property" that concerns Mr. Lennox is most likely Sully's Memoirs, published in 1755 by Millar and Robert and

James Dodsley, and "Mr. Murphy" is no doubt Arthur Murphy, a barrister who had already successfully dealt with a copyright issue in the case of Donaldson versus Becket (Bloom 231). Lennox had earlier offered to sell Dodsley and his partners a revised edition of Sully's Memoirs, but they had refused. Instead, they prepared to publish an unauthorized edition (Bloom 230). Lennox was understandably upset. According to the copyright decision made in the House of Lords February 22, 1774, Lennox's work was excluded from perpetual copyright (Small 52). Thus ownership and control of the Memoirs returned to her fourteen years after publication, in 1769. Two pirated editions had recently been published in Scotland[10] and Lennox not unreasonably wished to profit by the continued interest in her translation.

Lennox asked Samuel Johnson for further assistance in this matter in a second letter, written on May 29, 1778. Having been advised to bring out her own edition of the Memoirs to compete with the imminent Dodsley edition, she asked Johnson to help her with "a little address to the publick explaining my reasons for publishing Sully myself" (qtd. in Small 52). Lennox's stratagems were partially successful; although two editions of Sully's Memoirs were published in 1778, Dodsley, Rivington and their partners bought Lennox's "corrected copy for a reasonable consideration" (qtd. in Small 53).

Another demonstration of Johnson's esteem for Lennox is his use of her work in his Dictionary of the English Language (1755). Johnson's intention was to draw all his illustrations of usage from pre-Restoration authors, whose works he regarded "as the wells of English undefiled, as the pure sources of genuine diction." Johnson explains his decision in the Preface to the Dictionary:

> My purpose was to admit no testimony of living authours, that I might not be misled by partiality, and that none of my cotemporaries [sic] might have reason to complain; nor have I departed from this resolution, but when some performance of uncommon excellence excited my veneration, when my memory supplied me, from late books, with an example that was wanting, or when my heart, in the tenderness of friendship, solicited admission for a favourite name. (¶60)

According to Allen Read in "The Contemporary Quotations in Johnson's Dictionary," Lennox is one of only seven living authors used by Johnson, the others being Richardson, Macbean (only for etymological material), Moore, Garrick, Delany and Young (247).

Johnson quoted from two of Lennox's works to clarify six words: from Shakespear Illustrated to define whetstone, wherever and wreath,[11] and from The Female Quixote to clarify suppose, talent, and wildly. Johnson's illustration

of talent[12] with a quotation from The Female Quixote has been considered a particular compliment to Lennox.

In summary, we know that Lennox and Johnson were friends for over thirty-four years, that Johnson valued their association, and that he considered Lennox to be a "Great genius," superior to some of the most accomplished women of the day. Their correspondence reveals two close friends whose goodwill was expressed in both their private and professional lives. Johnson thought enough of Lennox and her work to use it in his own great project. He also advised Lennox about subscription publishing, recommended at least one translation project to her, comforted her when she was discouraged, introduced her to people who could assist her with her work, and mediated with the booksellers on her behalf. Obviously their professional relationship was unbalanced; Johnson, with his vast experience in the literary field, could be useful to Lennox in many more ways than she could ever hope to reciprocate. This is not to say, however, that Lennox did not try to assist Johnson; she mounts a spirited attack on Johnson's detractors in The Female Quixote, for example.

Duncan Isles maintains that Johnson assisted Lennox extensively in a material fashion by writing more dedications and proposals for her than he did for any other author (1967: 36). This is no small claim since Johnson wrote so many dedications, prefaces, essays and occasional

pieces for other writers that not only is it nearly impossible for modern scholars to determine the Johnson canon, Johnson himself could probably not have done so. Because he told Boswell or made a note of it in his diary, we can be certain that Johnson wrote the following pieces for or about Lennox: the dedication to Shakespear Illustrated (1: 19), Proposals for the Works of Mrs. Charlotte Lennox (1: 22),[13] and a review of Sully's Memoirs (1: 309).

When Johnson did not specifically acknowledge a piece, however, we must look for other evidence in order to establish the authorship of the questioned text. Unfortunately, external evidence is usually limited and inconclusive, and internal evidence is often reducible to the argument that a passage "sounds like Johnson." Boswell gives no other justification than "internal evidence" for placing the dedications of The Female Quixote (1: 12, 367) and the translation of both "A Dissertation on the Greek Comedy" and the "General Conclusion" for The Greek Theatre of Father Brumoy in his chronology of Johnson's work (1: 21, 345).

The difficulties of the attribution process become obvious with an examination of Allen Hazen's Samuel Johnson's Prefaces and Dedications (1937). Hazen argues that Johnson wrote the dedications for six of Lennox's works, including the dedication of The Female Quixote to the

Earl of Middlesex (1752), Shakespear Illustrated to the Earl of Orrery (1753), Sully's Memoirs to the Duke of Newcastle (1755), Philander to Lord Charlemont (1757), Brumoy's Greek Theatre to the Prince of Wales (1760), and the second edition of Henrietta to the Duchess of Newcastle (1761). In his assignment of these works to Johnson, Hazen agrees with the earlier assessment of Miriam Small. The evidence on which Hazen and Small base their attributions is often weak, however, and convinces only if one is predisposed to believe that Johnson wrote the works in question.

Johnson specifically responded to questions about his role in the dedication of Shakespear Illustrated and Sully's Memoirs. Although, as stated previously, he acknowledged the dedication of the first as his work, his response when questioned about the second was ambiguous and served only to confuse the issue. In 1778 Johnson allowed the Preface to Sully to be recorded as his work (i.e., he did not contradict his authorship when it was read aloud as part of a list of his works). When Boswell later showed him a copy of this list, however, Johnson "laughed, and said, 'I was willing to let them go on as they pleased, and never interfered'" (qtd. in Hazen 111). Boswell then insisted that Johnson correct the list; he "read it to him, article by article, and got him positively to own or refuse" (qtd. Hazen 111). Boswell later wrote to Percy:

> I return you the list of Mr. Johnson's writings with many thanks. I must tell you however that he allowed Levet to dictate to you several errours, as for instance the Conquest of Goree, and the Preface to Sully. He corrected these errours himself to me. (qtd. in Hazen 111)

Small takes the "errour" to be the confusion of "Preface" for "Dedication"--a problem that continued for a number of years. As late as 1785, for example, the Gentleman's Magazine printed some remarks of Tyers which included the statement that Johnson "composed the Preface to the Poems of Miss Williams, to Sully's Memoirs, to Macbean's Classical Geography, and to Adams on the Globes" (qtd. in Hazen 112). According to Hazen,

> Since Johnson contributed to Miss Williams's Miscellanies an "Advertisement," to Macbean's Geography a "Preface," and to Adams's Treatise on the Globes a "Dedication," it is not a unreasonable assumption that Tyers intended to refer to the Dedication of Sully's Memoirs. (Hazen 112)

When Croker wrote the notes for his edition of the Life of Johnson, he ignored the controversy, and simply stated that "In 1755 Johnson seems to have written for Mrs. Lennox the dedication to Sully's Memoirs" (qtd. in Hazen 113).

Hazen argues that Johnson exploited the confusion to have some fun at the expense of the "literal-minded" Boswell; he had, after all, not written the Preface (112). Underlying Hazen's explanation of Johnson's behaviour is the assumption that he wrote the dedication. It should not be forgotten, however, that Johnson had the opportunity to acknowledge his contribution and chose not to do so--surely more likely an indication that he did not write the dedication than that he did. Hazen, though, remains "quite certain" of Johnson's authorship, and supports his attribution on the unsupported declaration that the style is distinctively Johnsonian (112). Small used similar arguments to reach the same conclusion, with the additional observation that Lennox would naturally turn to Johnson for the dedication to such an important book (19-20).

There is even less evidence that Johnson wrote the Dedication for Philander. Hazen admits that he has found "practically no external evidence for Johnson's authorship" beyond the fact that Lord Charlemont, the dedicatee, was a friend of Topham Beauclerk, and both were friends of Johnson's (102). Once again Hazen bases his attribution on his recognition of Johnson's "unmistakable" style (102). Small, too, had noted that the evidence that Johnson wrote Philander "is of the very slightest,--indication rather than evidence," but argued that

> Johnson had written many of Mrs. Lennox's dedications and was to write many more; there is no reason to believe that he had lost interest in her endeavors during these particular years. (23)

She supplemented this negative argument with negative evidence: "At the least, nothing definite influences one against the belief that Johnson wrote it" (23).

The dedication of Brumoy's Greek Theatre was first attributed to Johnson in 1929 by Mr. R. B. Adam in the Catalogue of his Johnsonian Library (Hazen 92). Hazen observes that there is again little external evidence that Johnson wrote the piece--only that Charlotte Lennox was ill and out of London during part of 1759 and 1760 and that Johnson was in the city at this time. Like Small, quoted above, Hazen builds upon the shaky foundation of his own previous attributions: Johnson "had already written four dedications for her, and he was assuredly quite as available for a dedication as he was for help in translating" (92). The only other support that Hazen offers is his own certainty: he labels the dedication one of "Johnson's best," and notes that it is "so certainly by Johnson" that Adams did not even notice that he was first critic to formally make the attribution. Small, who had also argued that the dedication "sounds as if it were written by Johnson," adds as external evidence the fact that Lennox's health was poor at this time; since there were several collaborators in the

project, and Lennox did little of the third volume, "it is likely that she would get as much help as possible in the final tasks, and where would she more naturally turn for a dedication than to Johnson?" (26).

The dedication of the second edition of Henrietta is attributed to Johnson by similar arguments. Hazen reasons that Lennox hoped that the Duchess of Newcastle would use her influence to find a position for Mr. Lennox; therefore, she

> must have been anxious to present the book with as fine a dedicatory address as possible, and it is almost inconceivable that she should not have turned to Johnson who as I believe had previously written no less than five similar addresses for her, one of them (Brumoy's Greek Theatre) little more than a year before. (Hazen 100)

Again, Hazen judges the style to be the "decisive" characteristic (Hazen 100).

There are a number of serious difficulties in the process by which Hazen and Small attribute the six Lennox dedications to Johnson. First of all, the external evidence for such attribution ranges from skimpy to non-existent. Secondly, both Hazen and Small are guilty of specious reasoning; one cannot use one's own attribution of a questionable text, which has itself been based on limited facts, as evidence of a second attribution. The third

problem is one of historical perspective. Johnson is now such a literary colossus that it is difficult to remember that much of his status and reputation would develop later in his career. Perhaps it was not "inconceivable" to Lennox to turn to someone else for a dedication, or to write it herself. The final difficulty is both the most serious and the most difficult to solve. Attributions by "internal evidence" are generally difficult to support. Both Hazen and Small, but especially Hazen, attribute dedications to Johnson based only on their subjective impression that the Lennox text is similar to works of Johnson. But labelling a disputed text as "obviously" or "unmistakeably" Johnsonian can hardly be considered evidence that Johnson wrote it. Much of what has been considered to be Johnsonian in style may simply reflect the general style of the period; common elements may be due to the influence of a general eighteenth-century style. The problem inherent in the use of strictly subjective criteria is obvious: if another critic disagrees, how do we decide who is correct?

I have attempted to sort out what we <u>know</u> of the connection between Lennox and Johnson from what has been assumed, supposed or imagined. Now, having discussed the known and (to some degree) the assumed, we move to the supposed and the imagined. Every writer and researcher who discusses the relationship between Lennox and Johnson indulges in some speculation and conjecture, and there is

little that Lennox accomplished that a resourceful critic cannot attribute directly or indirectly to Johnson.

Johnson was highly experienced in the production and marketing of writing, and thus would be an invaluable source of advice and assistance for a newcomer to the world of booksellers and printers. The general critical consensus has it that Johnson used his influence and his contacts in the service of Lennox's literary career. Isles, for example, believes that there is "sufficient grounds for claiming that Johnson's interest and influence played a major part in her [Lennox's] successful establishment as a professional writer" (1967: 41). In Gae Brack's scenario, Samuel Johnson is the secret force behind "Mrs. Lennox's first real professional success and notice" (i.e., the success of Harriot Stuart); he is "behind the curtain controlling the action of every scene" (59).

Because we know so little about Lennox's life and career during the period before Harriot Stuart, any notion of Johnson's involvement must be purely speculative. While admitting there is no evidence to connect Johnson with Lennox's Poems on Several Occasions, Gae Brack speculates that there is a good chance Johnson knew Lennox or her work by the publication of the collection in 1747, since at this point Lennox would have known both Strahan and Alexander Lennox. Critics have also speculated about possible early connections between Lennox and Johnson through the

Gentleman's Magazine. Lennox received attention in its poetry section between 1749 and 1750,[14] a period in which Johnson was actively--although not formally--involved with the periodical (Brack 55). Gae Brack "envision[s]" a

> young Charlotte Lennox, still needy after her imprudent marriage to an unreliable means of support and determined to publish her poems despite the failure of the Proposals, bringing her poems to St. Johns Gate . . . [and] bask[ing] in the intellectual sunshine of the great. . . . (56)

Sherbo has suggested that Johnson wrote the notice of Harriot Stuart that appeared in the December 1750 issue of the Gentleman's Magazine (139)--a notice argued to be the first critical review of a novel ever to appear in that periodical. Duncan Isles has challenged the attribution to Johnson, arguing that there is "no evidence in its favour," although he does concede that

> it is remarkable that the Gentleman's Magazine gave outstandingly enthusiastic support to Mrs. Lennox's works throughout the 1750s. In view of Johnson's association with the Magazine, then, it is by no means unlikely that, in general terms, his influence made some contribution to this favourable attitude. (1967: 42)

Brack agrees, suggesting that if Johnson did not write the notice for Harriot Stuart himself, he may have encouraged or convinced Cave to have it written: "That Cave continued to give up to Mrs. Lennox copy space in the Gentleman's Magazine may be attributed to Johnson's continuing solicitation for her work" (Gae Brack 59).

It has been suggested that Johnson boosted Lennox's career with other favourable notices and reviews. In 1887 G. Birkbeck Hill in his edition of the Life of Johnson suggested that Johnson was responsible for the review of The Female Quixote in the Gentleman's Magazine of March 1752 (1: 367).[15] Sherbo speculated that Johnson wrote the notice for the first two volumes of Shakespear Illustrated for the same magazine in May of 1753 (Gae Brack 108). Isles again disagrees, arguing that there is not enough internal evidence to make the claim even tentatively (1967: 44), while Small takes the more conservative position that Johnson's influence with the periodical "may have had something to do with the favorable mention [of Shakespear Illustrated] there and the space granted for an entire reprint of the criticism on Romeo and Juliet" (18). It has also been suggested that Johnson reviewed the Memoirs of Sully for The Literary Magazine in October of 1756 and that the laudatory review of Memoirs of Madame de Maintenon that followed a year later in the same periodical was the result of his influence (Gae Brack 135).

It is, of course, difficult, if not impossible, to prove that Johnson used his influence on Lennox's behalf without external evidence; it is equally difficult to discover in what ways he influenced her writing and publishing. Certainly Giuseppi Baretti believed that Johnson adversely affected her poetic style. In an Italian ode addressed to her he chastises Lennox for allowing Johnson to lead her away from pastoral and love poetry to more serious and moral topics. The ode also suggests that Baretti felt Johnson was responsible for Lennox's increasing interest in translation rather than poetry. He writes that some "fatal powers" have made her "rebel against Phoebus and Love" (qtd. in Gae Brack 97). According to Baretti the "secret cause of all this waywardness" is "Johnson, inflexible Englishman, who thinks a graceful nothing a sin and a vice; who weighs for a month in the balance of his judgment every one of his own lines" (qtd. in Gae Brack 97). It is true that Lennox's writing became more serious in tone in the course of her career and that she turned increasingly to translation projects. It is difficult, however, to establish that Johnson was responsible for her greater seriousness--maturity and personal hardship could also have been the cause. As discussed previously, we know that Johnson suggested at least one translation project. Critics have speculated that Johnson encouraged her to take on various others including the translation of Shakespeare's

sources for Shakespear Illustrated (1753-1754),[16] Sully's Memoirs (1755), the Memoirs of Madame de Maintenon (1757), and The Greek Theatre of Father Brumoy (1760).

Johnson also probably influenced Lennox's relations with her publishers. Again it is difficult specifically to identify Johnson's influence. Critics, however, have offered various suppositions. Gae Brack, for example, believes Johnson "must have" had something to do with Lennox changing booksellers between Poems on Several Occasions and Harriot Stuart (57). The first she published with Samuel Paterson and the second with Payne and Bouquet. Brack offers as evidence the fact that Payne not only was a friend of Johnson's and a member of the Club, but also--with Bouquet--published for him in 1750 (58). Isles speculates that Richardson, Orrery and ("no doubt") Johnson must have convinced Millar to change his mind when he at one point refused to publish The Female Quixote (1967: 43). Brack says nothing of Millar, but speculates that the same three men may have attempted to find a publisher for The Female Quixote (99).

We know that Johnson introduced Lennox to several useful people, including Samuel Richardson and Lord Orrery. Critics (especially Gae Brack) tend to give credit to Johnson for anything that these people then did for Lennox (Brack 70,95). In addition, it has been suggested that Johnson both introduced Lennox to Robert Dodsley and may

have encouraged her to translate for him, especially Sully's Memoirs. Isles considers Johnson's enthusiasm for Harriot Stuart a possible indication that Johnson introduced Lennox and Dodsley (1967: 42).

One final area of speculation, and the one that this thesis is the most concerned with, is the probable direct assistance from Johnson to Lennox with her writing. Isles has speculated, for example, that Johnson's participation in Shakespear Illustrated went beyond the writing of the Dedication to "more fundamental contributions" including suggesting the project, guiding the research and collaborating to some extent on the work along with Lord Orrery (44, "LC" #1,56). Isles argues against Johnson's "deep" involvement in the work because of its "illogical and imperceptive argument" ("LC"). Johnson has also been argued to have written the penultimate chapter of The Female Quixote. This assertion will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Notes

1. That Lennox met Johnson through Strahan has been accepted by Miriam Small. The Paterson version is accepted by the DNB (Hazen 90n).

A rather strange account of the meeting between Lennox and Johnson was presented in the "Memoir of Mrs. Lennox" (The Lady's Monthly Museum. June 1813, 313-15):

> It was soon after the publication of the former work [Harriot Stuart] that she was introduced to Dr. Johnson, as a young lady of considerable genius; but nothing could exceed the astonishment of Mrs. Lennox, at the odd manner in which she was received. The doctor took her on his knee, as if a mere child; after which he carried her in his arms, to show her his library; and, as if resolved to be uniform in his conduct, sent his servant to a pastry-cook, to purchase some cakes for the young lady. Mrs. Lennox found herself greatly embarrassed; but a respect for his character stifled even the idea of resentment, and she preserved an intimacy with him till near the period of his decease. (313-14)

This account places their meeting after the publication of Harriot Stuart whereas by Hawkins's report they meet before its release to the public.

2. There is no indication when Johnson made this statement or to whom. I have included it, however, because it is presented as a direct quotation and it is consistent with other remarks made by Johnson about Lennox.

3. Frances Burney was understandably upset at this evidence of Johnson's partiality for Charlotte Lennox. In her diary she refers to Johnson's statement while giving the account of a visit by Mr. Turbulent in 1791:

> He was eager to inquire of me who was Mrs. Lenox? He had been reading, like all the rest of the world, Boswell's Life of Dr. Johnson, and the preference there expressed of Mrs. Lenox to all other females had filled him with astonishment, as he had never even heard her name.
>
> These occasional sallies of Dr. Johnson, uttered from local causes and circumstances, but all retailed verbatim by Mr. Boswell, are filling all sorts of readers with amaze, except the small part to whom Dr. Johnson was known, and who, by acquaintance with the power of the moment over his unguarded conversation, know how little of his solid opinion was to be gathered from his accidental assertion. (Diary and Letters Ed. Dobson. 4: 476, qtd. in Small 49)

4. This note is quoted in Appendix J of Boswell's Life of Johnson 4: 523-24.

5. This account was challenged in the 1786 biography of Samuel Johnson probably written by James Harrison ("The Life of Dr. Samuel Johnson" in The Early Biographies of Samuel Johnson. O M Brack, Jr. and Robert E. Kelley, eds.). Harrison retells the account of the celebration as related by Hawkins, then adds:

> The learned knight [Sir John Hawkins], however, must certainly have either had recourse to his own ample fund of invention, or mistaken what might be jocosely proposed at the club for what actually took place at this celebrity; since Mrs. Lennox has lately been heard to declare, that she can by no means remember what is so very ingeniously represented as a coronation, though she perfectly well recollects the circumstance of receiving a sprig of laurel stuck in her glass of jelly." (273)

6. The "Lennox Collection" is hereafter designated with "LC."

7. The playful tone has been argued to be double-edged especially in the compliment that follows: "Your remarks are I think all very judicious, clearly expressed, and incontrovertibly certain. When Shakespeare is demolished your wings will be full summed and I will fly you at Milton . . ." ("LC" #11, 38-39). Duncan Isles notes that the "statement has a superficial appearance of eulogy, but the whole letter appears to have a playful tone (as in the use of "demolished" and "incontrovertibly") which ought to prevent our full acceptance of the statement as a serious, objective judgement" ("LC" 39 n56). My point is that the teasing tone of the letter, double-edged or not, indicates the closeness of the relationship between Johnson and Lennox.

8. In Letter 17, "LC" p. 49. There is no evidence that Lennox ever completed such a work.

9. Although we cannot be certain what "the whole affair" refers to, Isles has suggested that it had something to do with the promotion of Harriot Stuart. Payne had paid for the printing of "1000 Proposals for Mrs Lennox" (probably for a subscription edition of her poems) and Payne and Bouquet had published the novel on December 13, 1751. The GM gave Lennox considerable attention at this time including the publication of flattering poems about Lennox and two of her own poems in November 1751, a very positive notice of Harriot Stuart in December 1751, and yet another complimentary poem in January 1751 ("LC" 334 n5).

10. In 1773 John Robertson published one edition in Edinburgh and A. Kincaid and W. Creech published another. These were two of the eventual fourteen editions of Sully's Memoirs that were produced including eight English, two Scottish, one American and three that were both English and Scottish.

11. That all three words illustrated with quotations from Shakespear Illustrated begin with a "w" is surely not a coincidence. An obvious explanation is that Johnson was reading Lennox's book while working through the latter part of the alphabet. This, however, does not lessen the honour of being included in Johnson's great work.

12. Johnson uses a line from The Female Quixote to illustrate his second meaning of talent: "Faculty; power; gift of nature. A metaphor borrowed from the talents mentioned in the holy writ." The line used is "Persons who possess the true talent of raillery are like comets; they are seldom seen, and all at once admired and feared."

13. "1775 . . . --The first effort of his pen in 1775 was, "Proposals for publishing the Works of Mrs. Charlotte Lennox," in three volumes quarto. In his diary, January 2, I find this entry: "Wrote Charlotte's Proposals." But, indeed, the internal evidence would have been quite sufficient" (Boswell, Life of Johnson 2: 289-90).

14. Two flattering poems about Charlotte Lennox appeared in the Gentleman's Magazine in response to her poetry. The first, which appeared in June of 1749, was entitled "To Mrs. C. L., upon seeing her Poems and Proposals for Printing them." The second, appearing in the November issue in 1750, was "To Mrs. C. L. On reading her Poems, printing by Subscription in one vo. price 5s." and was signed by E. N. (Small 8). In this same issue were published two poems signed by Lennox: "The Art of Coquetry" and "Birthday Ode to the Princess of Wales."

15. Although Small accepted the attribution (13), Brack considers it unlikely since Johnson was doing less for the magazine in 1752, and an internal allusion points to the reviewer being not closely connected to Richardson, and, finally, the review is not in Johnson's style (it is just a plot summary and a quotation of Fielding's March 24 review) (Gae Brack 80).

16. There is some evidence that Johnson encouraged Lennox to take on this project. Johnson published two sets of proposals for an edition of Shakespeare (1745, 1756). Although for various reasons the work did not proceed, Johnson continued to be interested in the project. The proposals (1756) indicate that Johnson intended to examine Shakespeare's sources. Thus, he had several reasons to suggest that Lennox translate these sources: the work filled a gap in the scholarship, Lennox needed the money and the results would be of use to him in his own projected edition of Shakespeare (Small 185). Another bit of evidence is in the letter Johnson wrote to Lennox after the publication of Shakespear Illustrated. When he writes that "when Shakespeare is demolished your wings will be full summed and I will fly you at Milton . . ."

the implication is that he flew her at Shakespeare ("LC" #11, 38-39).

CHAPTER III: THE DISPUTED CHAPTER

The first attribution of the penultimate chapter of The Female Quixote to Samuel Johnson was made by Reverend John Mitford nearly a hundred years after the novel's publication. He writes in the August 1843 issue of The Gentleman's Magazine:

> it appears to me, as well from the introduction of the subject as from the style, that the whole of the eleventh chapter of the ninth and concluding book of the "Female Quixote" was written by Dr. Johnson . . . --indeed I should have no scruple in admitting this chapter among the acknowledged works of Johnson. (20: 132)

Mitford discusses his theory further in the January 1844 issue of the same periodical, including in this article the complete text of the disputed chapter.

The evidence with which Mitford supports his attribution is in essence the argument that continues to be marshalled today. Mitford argues that the real proof of Johnson's authorship rests on internal evidence--"this chapter is totally different both in style and subject from the rest of the work" (GM 21: 41)--but offers no specific examples of this difference. Instead, like many of the critics who will follow, Mitford assumes the rhetorical position that the attribution is so obvious it hardly needs

to be discussed. He prefaces his January 1844 discussion of the chapter, for example, by observing:

> It is curious that it [the chapter] should have escaped the notice of his [Johnson's] different critics and commentators; but the book in which it is found is now so little known that probably very few of your readers have ever looked into it. (41)

Once, however, readers have access to the chapter through his article, Mitford assumes they will immediately recognize Johnson's hand in its composition.

Reverend Mitford does, however, discuss several pieces of external evidence that point to Johnson's involvement. First of all, he considers the heading of the Chapter ("Being, in the Author's Opinion, the best Chapter in this History") to be "very significant of its not having been written by the author of the rest of the volume" (GM 21: 41).

Secondly, Mitford considers it significant that twice in The Female Quixote Lennox "diverges from her subject to praise Dr. Johnson in the highest terms," in what Mitford considers a very unexpected and forcible manner (20: 132). The first "digression" occurs in the sixth book of Volume 2:

> Nay then, interrupted Mr. Glanville, you are qualified for a Critic at the Bedford Coffee-house; where, with the rest of your Brothers, Demy-wits, you may sit in Judgement upon the

> Productions of a Young, a Richardson, or a Johnson. Rail with unpremeditated Malice at the Rambler; and, for want of Faults, turn even its inimitable Beauties into Ridicule: The Language, because it reaches to Perfection, may be called stiff, laboured, and pedantic; the Criticisms, when they let in more Light than your weak Judgement can bear, superficial and ostentatious Glitter; and because those Papers contain the finest System of Ethics yet extant, damn the queer Fellow, for over-propping Virtue; an excellent new Phrase! which those who can find no Meaning in, may accommodate with one of their own; then give shrewd Hints, that some Persons, though they do not publish their Performances, may have more Merit, than those that do. (252-53)

The second expression of Lennox's regard for Johnson occurs in the disputed chapter itself:

> Truth is not always injured by Fiction. An admirable Writer of our own Time [Richardson], has found the way to convey the most solid Instructions, the noblest Sentiments, and the most exalted Piety, in the pleasing Dress of a Novel [Clarissa], and, to use the Words of the greatest Genius in the present Age ["The Author of the

Rambler"], "Has taught the Passions to move at the Command of Virtue."[1] (377)

The "greatest Genius in the present Age" is, of course, Johnson; Mitford believes that Lennox added the sentence to Johnson's chapter in order to express her "gratitude for the assistance afforded her" (21: 41).

There is no doubt at all that Lennox thought very highly of Johnson; as discussed in the previous chapter, he was a good friend who encouraged and advised Lennox personally and professionally. Surely, however, these quotations are as likely to be the product of Lennox's ongoing affection and esteem as they are to be a result of a specific act of Johnson's.

Mitford is equally cynical about Johnson's motives; he considers that the two passages praising Johnson in The Female Quixote explain "to some degree Johnson's partiality toward" Lennox (20: 132). He is more generous in the 1844 article, noting that Johnson "highly esteemed and praised the talents of Mrs. Lennox," and adding a postscript in which he listed a number of examples of Johnson's interest. These include Johnson's quoting of the dedication to Mrs. Lennox's "Shakespeare Illustrated"; Mr. Croker's comment that "Johnson was always extremely kind to her"; the fact that Johnson wrote the Dedication for The Female Quixote and the 1775 Proposals for Lennox; Johnson's remark to Goldsmith when the latter had been advised to go and hiss Lennox's

play; and Johnson's oft-quoted comment in which he indicated the superiority of Lennox over Elizabeth Carter, Hannah More, and Frances Burney (21: 41). Mitford concludes that the "external evidence shews what would be Johnson's disposition to assist Mrs. Lennox; the internal evidence of this chapter, that he did" (GM 21: 1844).

Miriam Rossiter Small essentially endorses Reverend Mitford's position in her biography of Charlotte Lennox. She agrees that Johnson wrote the "greater part of Book IX, chapter 11," claiming, as Mitford did, that stylistically the chapter is very different from the rest of the novel. She feels that the tone especially is "radically" different from the rest of The Female Quixote (Small 80).

Small argues that the chapter is marked as Johnson's by its subject matter as well as by its style. She notes, for example, the similarity between the following passage from the chapter and the theme of Rasselas:

> some very mortifying Reflections on the Imperfections of all human Happiness, and the uncertain Consequences of all those Advantages which we think ourselves not only at Liberty to desire, but oblig'd to cultivate. (369)[2]

In Small's assessment, passages of the chapter "contain a depth of thought and a balance of expression" which are not found elsewhere in The Female Quixote, but which are characteristic of Samuel Johnson (81).

While Small agrees that Johnson wrote the body of the disputed chapter, she believes that Lennox wrote the opening and closing paragraphs in addition to the compliment. These paragraphs, she argues, are merely transitional, and bear no mark of Johnson (81). Small agrees with Mitford that Johnson would not have written the compliment to himself (therefore, if he wrote the chapter, Lennox had to have added it), and spends some effort to isolate exactly what has been inserted. According to Small there are two possibilities: Lennox could have either inserted the words "and, to use the Words of the greatest Genius in the present Age" and the footnotes explaining the allusions, or she could have written the entire sentence and inserted it (Small 80-81). Small considers it likely that Johnson wrote everything in the passage except the complimentary clause since the words surrounding this clause repeat what Johnson had been known to say about Richardson. As evidence that Lennox added the clause to Johnson's sentence, Small offers her judgment that "the clause including the compliment to Johnson sounds like an insertion" and her conviction that the passage reads more smoothly without it (Small 80).

To add to the external evidence that Mitford advanced, Small cites Frances Burney's comment from the Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay:

> I dare say he [Johnson] hardly knows himself what he has written; for he has made numerous prefaces,

> dedications, odd chapters, and I know not what, for other authors, that he has never owned. (qtd. in Small, 79)

Small suggests that the chapter in The Female Quixote is one of these "odd chapters."

Allen Hazen agrees. In Samuel Johnson's Prefaces and Dedications Hazen also uses the Burney quotation as evidence that Johnson wrote this particular piece. Hazen reasons that since he personally knows of no other chapters that would fit this category, the chapter under discussion must be the one Burney is recalling (95). He agrees with Small's attribution of the complimentary clause and the first and last paragraphs to Lennox and the rest of the chapter to Johnson, but questions whether Johnson would have been guilty of the grammatically infelicitous "You was" which appears in the sixth paragraph[3] (Hazen 95n1).

Another critic who believes the chapter to be Johnson's and has written on the subject is Carey McIntosh, who includes a discussion of the subject in his book, The Choice of Life: Samuel Johnson and the World of Fiction (1973). He notes that the letter Richardson wrote to Lennox advising her to consult with Johnson about Arabella's "cure" at the very least "sets the stage for Johnson to intervene directly" (14n1). McIntosh does not question the attribution of the chapter; he believes the style of the chapter to be "unmistakably Johnsonian, always vigorous and

precise, sometimes bookish" (15). What he does question is the long-held critical evaluation of the chapter as inferior work; critics have "unanimously found the chapter dry and unconvincing" and argued that Arabella should have been cured through experience rather than argument (McIntosh 15). McIntosh, accepting Johnson as author of the chapter, defends him against such charges:

> From denigrations of this sort Johnson can be defended. Arabella's disease is defined by her immunity to experience, by the agility with which she invents romantic explanations for unromantic events. Having successfully held out against patient remonstrance and incontrovertible fact for almost two volumes, she is not likely to give in to anything less formidable than an intellectual bulldozer, which Johnson provided. Nec deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus inciderit. As for form, the heavy dialectics of this chapter are anticipated to some extent by Arabella's disquisitions on the philosophy of Romance, and by previous attempts to reason her out of her delusions. The chapter in question is not without drama, not without comedy, and linked at several points with the principal action. (McIntosh 15-16)

The chapter is thus connected to the rest of The Female Quixote through theme, form, and the use of drama and comedy.

McIntosh is interested in this particular chapter because he believes that it "sums up his [Johnson's] opinions on romance in no uncertain terms" and allies him "vaguely but reliably" with the narrative tradition of Don Quixote (16).[4]

McIntosh does not seem to be aware that his defense of Johnson's artistic ability undercuts the argument against this chapter being written by Lennox. McIntosh's contention that the chapter is well-connected to the rest of The Female Quixote argues as well that Lennox wrote the entire book as it does that Johnson's artistic judgment and execution was flawless. Basically McIntosh has reduced the attribution argument to a discussion of internal evidence: is this chapter in the style of Lennox or is it in the style of Johnson?

Although the majority of critics believe the chapter is the work of Samuel Johnson, there are a few who are not convinced; Margaret Dalziel, the editor of the 1970 Oxford English Novels edition of The Female Quixote, is one of these. Although she offers several additional arguments to those already discussed, she judges the evidence to be insufficient to make the attribution to Johnson.

Dalziel notes that in at least two scenes where Arabella is being presented as being unusually sensible and knowledgable for a young woman, Lennox has borrowed extensively from other authors (414). Dalziel takes such borrowing as a signal that Lennox lacked confidence in her ability to write serious conversation, and suspects that other analogues could be found for Arabella's other serious speeches. This being the case, Dalziel argues, it is not likely that Lennox would attempt to write such an important scene as the one between Arabella and the doctor (414).

In the notes for the chapter in her edition of The Female Quixote Dalziel observes that the chapter exhibits many of the features of Johnson's style identified by W. K. Wimsatt in The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson (1941), including parallelism of single words, phrases, clauses and sentences; a high proportion of abstract words and phrases; the use of unusual words such as "Sacerdotal" and "uncouth"; some "literary" verb forms; and the inversion of the usual order of clauses or phrases (414). Dalziel also notes that the proportion of monosyllabic nouns to the total number of nouns is closer to Johnson than to the rest of The Female Quixote, but that sentences are on average shorter than Johnson's (415). Both the sentence length and noun-proportion data from Johnson were derived from an analysis of The Rambler, rather than Johnson's fiction. Like Small, Dalziel notices "an abstract logical way of thought" that

she considers characteristic of Johnson and a "marked and sustained sententiousness" in the content of the chapter that "has no parallel elsewhere in the book" (415). Margaret Dalziel, however, considers that the evidence of Johnson's authorship is inconclusive and concludes that the attribution remains only a "plausible theory" (415)

Another critic who remains unconvinced by the arguments discussed above is Duncan Isles (Appendix, Female Quixote 422). Isles argues that it is significant that there was no contemporary suggestion that Johnson wrote the chapter. Furthermore, he is convinced that "structurally, the dialogue and argument are far below Johnson's standard," and "linguistically, there appears to be nothing in it that a good writer familiar with Johnson's style could not have achieved" (Appendix, Female Quixote 422).

Although Isles judges the evidence insufficient to claim that Johnson wrote the chapter, he does not doubt that Johnson was involved in its production. Given the evidence of the Richardson letter, he considers it safe to assume that Lennox discussed the conclusion of her novel with Johnson. Further, Lennox "obviously" had Johnson in mind when she created "the pious and learned Doctor----." According to Isles, there is also little doubt that she was influenced by his ideas and style in the chapter (Appendix, Female Quixote 422). Isles concludes: "On the whole, it would seem best to regard the chapter, with all its faults,

as wholly Mrs. Lennox's until definite evidence to the contrary is found" (Appendix Female Quixote 422).

We have discussed a number of critics who are convinced that Johnson wrote the chapter--including Reverend Mitford, Miriam Rossiter Small, Allen Hazen and Carey McIntosh, and two--Margaret Dalziel and Duncan Isles--who consider the evidence insufficient to make the attribution. In contrast to these positions Gae Brack believes there is convincing evidence that Lennox and not Johnson wrote the chapter.

In Samuel Johnson and Four Literary Women, Gae Brack works her way through the evidence that Johnson wrote the chapter that has been discussed above. First, she argues that the chapter heading is not particularly significant. She notes that this type of heading is a familiar device in the eighteenth century and discusses a number of possible reasons for its inclusion: Lennox may have considered it the best chapter of the book because Johnson was the model for the doctor, or because Johnson provided both the model and the idea, or because the chapter is the climax of the book and contains the moral, and so on (Brack 86). On the matter of Lennox's praise for Johnson in The Female Quixote, Brack observes that Lennox praises Richardson and Young in the same fashion and no one suggests that they wrote the chapter.

According to Brack the style of the chapter is not all that different from the rest of the novel; Arabella speaks

in an artificial and elaborate language throughout the book. Furthermore, differences in tone and content are to be expected; as the climax of the story this chapter should differ from the rest of the novel.

Brack's argument is in fact a negative one; she believes that Lennox wrote the chapter because the chapter lacks the "quality" of Samuel Johnson's writing (85). According to Brack, the chapter reads like a parody of Johnson; the "stilted, unclear speech is inferior to that style of writing Johnson occasionally employed in the periodical essays he was writing before and during" this period (83). Brack agrees with Dalziel that there is a "marked and sustained sententiousness," but considers that this sententiousness is in contexts where Johnson would not have used it: "even in fun, such serious thoughts are to be reserved for elevated poetry, prayers, sermons, and prose essays. . . . Johnson may have permitted these sentiments to be written by Mrs. Lennox . . . but he would not himself have written the words in this particular fictional context" (Brack 83, 84). As to the chapter being similar in subject or theme to Johnson's works, Brack argues that the chapter includes so many of Johnson's favourite subjects and themes that it "reads like excerpts from scores of Rambler essays, excerpts not very tightly connected by logic" (85).

Brack's argument seems hardly complimentary to Lennox, but Brack believes that her theory is actually more

flattering to Lennox than theories that have Johnson as author of the chapter:

> That Mrs. Lennox wrote the chapter herself, modeling her character on Johnson and basing the content of the chapter on Johnson's ideas, argues for a closer understanding and appreciation between them than would be indicated from his simply writing the chapter at request and handing it over to her as he might a dedication or a preface. . . . The entire episode behind The Female Quixote illustrates how secure Mrs. Lennox was in Johnson's understanding and support, and how tolerant and helpful Johnson remained throughout the writing, dedication, and publication of Mrs. Lennox's second novel. (Brack 88)

The problem is obviously very complex, with critics using the same information as the basis for very different conclusions. An additional complication has been pointed out by Robert Hay Carnie.[5] In a paper given at the 1984 Samuel Johnson meeting at Pembroke College, he notes that there are physical differences in the first and second halves of the disputed chapter in the first edition which may indicate a difference in authorship. This additional problem will be discussed in the following chapter.

Notes

1. The words "Has taught the Passions to move at the Command of Virtue" are from Johnson's introduction to Rambler no. 97 (February 19, 1751), which Samuel Richardson wrote. The allusions to Richardson, Clarissa and Johnson ("The Author of the Rambler") which I have included in square brackets are identified by Lennox in footnotes.

2. It is interesting that Small considers the similarity of this passage to the theme of Rasselas evidence that Johnson wrote the chapter. Since Rasselas was written seven years after The Female Quixote, it would seem more logical that Lennox influenced Johnson than vice versa.

3. Hazen notes that, according to Percy Fitzgerald (Critical Examination of Hill's "Johnsonian" Editions, London: 1898, 35), Johnson used the form "You was" on several occasions (Hazen, 95n). Lennox, however, often used the form. Examples abound in Harriot Stuart and Henrietta and she uses it several times--outside of the chapter--in The Female Quixote.

4. Johnson's interest in romance has been considered a possible motivation for his assisting Charlotte Lennox with The Female Quixote. According to the following passage from Boswell's Life of Johnson, Johnson apparently read a good number of romances when he was a boy:

> Dr. Percy, the Bishop of Dromore . . . informs me, that "when a boy he was immoderately fond of reading romances of chivalry, and he retained his fondness for them through life; so that (adds his Lordship) spending part of a summer at my parsonage-house in the country, he chose for his regular reading the old Spanish romance of FELIXMARTE OF HIRCANIA, in folio, which he read quite through. Yet I have heard him attribute to these extravagant fictions that unsettled turn of mind which prevented his ever fixing in any profession." (1: 48-49)

5. Unfortunately, I was not able to obtain a copy of Professor Carnie's paper. I am indebted to O M Brack, Jr. for the information concerning this matter (personal correspondence).

CHAPTER IV: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

If the authorship of the disputed chapter is considered strictly in terms of Johnson and Lennox, there are four logical possibilities:

1. Lennox wrote the entire chapter.

2. Johnson wrote the entire chapter.

3. Lennox and Johnson collaborated in some fashion on the chapter.

4. Neither Lennox nor Johnson wrote the chapter.

Of these four possibilities, the first (that Lennox wrote the entire chapter herself) must be considered the default solution. The chapter appeared under her name and was neither claimed by anyone else nor acknowledged by Lennox to be anyone else's work. In the absence of a direct statement on the matter by either Lennox or Johnson, the chapter must be assumed to be Lennox's. The task is thus to prove Johnson's involvement rather than Lennox's. This is a shift in perspective--albeit an obvious one--from the previous discussions of this problem which generally place the burden of proof on Lennox. This shift in viewpoint has potentially important consequences, because it alters how we weigh the evidence for or against various possible solutions.

What follows are the results of my efforts to establish Johnson's possible involvement in <u>The Female Quixote</u> through a statistical analysis of style. I chose this method with

the hope that a quantitative analysis would offer a foundation for discussion that is not provided by the inherently unanswerable subjective approach of "it's Johnson because it sounds like Johnson to me." I preface my results with a brief discussion of my assumptions and methodology.

II

The basic assumption underlying this study is that a writer's style is distinctive and thus can act as evidence in authorship problems. The difficulty with using style as a criterion, however, is that, while we may recognize various styles when we encounter them, we often have difficulty articulating the exact parameters of the differences we perceive. This is the source of the "sounds like" argument. Stylistic studies try to overcome this difficulty by analyzing style in quantifiable terms, attempting to break down the various aspects of style into countable and comparable units.

Any writer who faces a blank page with something to say is confronted with a wide array of possible stylistic variations, including the choice between various synonyms and colloquialisms, different sentence lengths, and the repetition of words or sounds. Although a writer may use any or all of the options a language offers, depending on his or her requirements, the supposition underlying stylistic and linguistic studies is that a writer, faced with comparable situations, will tend to favour certain

options over others. This privileging of certain optional features constitutes a writer's "style." Each writer actually will have a number of styles or variations on his or her style, favouring certain syntagmatic and paradigmatic aspects of the language depending on the intended audience and the purpose for writing. A writer will tend to use longer and more complex sentences in a formal essay than he or she will in a personal letter, for example.

III

The disputed chapter in The Female Quixote is almost entirely composed of a serious philosophical debate between Arabella and a learned doctor. All but a few sentences in the chapter are in the form of direct speech between these two characters. Since the bulk of the chapter is in the form of dialogue, and since dialogue and narrative are arguably different stylistically, I chose to restrict my analysis to passages of direct speech. In this I followed the practice of J. F. Burrows, who limits his analysis of Jane Austen, published in Computation Into Criticism: A Study of Jane Austen's Novels and an Experiment in Method (1987), to function words occurring in dialogue. I deleted all narrative from the chapter, which in actual fact meant omitting only a few sentences in the body of the chapter and all of the first and last paragraphs. Since the opening and closing paragraphs have been argued to have been transitional segments added by Lennox to Johnson's

contribution, my method had the added advantage of avoiding potentially problematic material.

My strategy was to compare the disputed chapter statistically to the known writings of Lennox and Johnson, using passages from both authors as similar as possible in content and structure to the disputed chapter. Optimally, I wanted to compare the dialogue in the chapter to serious, philosophical dialogues in fiction written by Lennox and by Johnson at approximately the same date. This was fairly easy to do with Johnson, who wrote The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abyssinia in 1759. Rasselas is Johnson's only sustained piece of fiction and contains numerous passages of philosophic debate; these provided the population from which I drew my samples of Johnson's writing.

It proved difficult to find suitable material outside The Female Quixote from which to draw the necessary Lennox samples. The Life of Harriot Stuart (1750) and Henrietta (1758) both lacked comparable passages of serious dialogue; the emphasis in these novels is on the romantic adventures of the heroine rather than logical disputation. Although much of the dialogue in The Female Quixote concerns the love-relationship between Arabella and Glanville, the conversations in this novel tend to be much more serious than those in Harriot Stuart and Henrietta. In the end, I chose to draw the entire Lennox population from The Female Quixote, excluding, of course, the disputed chapter.

In summary, the base from which I gathered my known-Johnson and known-Lennox samples consisted of serious, non-romantic dialogue, generally on philosophic subjects. The population from Johnson was drawn from Rasselas and consisted of 17,657 words or approximately seventy pages. A similar population of discourse was drawn from The Female Quixote of around sixty-nine pages or 17,284 words. After the narrative portions were removed, the disputed chapter consisted of 4910 words.

IV

In order to do the statistical analysis, I used two computer programs: LitStats and the Oxford Concordance Package (OCP). LitStats is a program developed by Dr. Stephen Reimer specifically for literary analysis. It collects and provides a statistical breakdown of a desired sample in five categories: Word Repetition or Frequency of Occurrence, Word Length, Frequency of Initial Letter, Sentence Length and Verbal Segment Length. I collected two sets of samples from each of the three populations. First, I randomly selected ten samples of 100 words from each population for the analysis of Word Repetition, Frequency of Initial Letter, and Word Length. Secondly, I collected eight thirty-five sentence samples from both the Female Quixote and the Rasselas populations for the analysis of Sentence Length and Verbal Segment Length. Because the disputed chapter contained 168 sentences, I could collect

only three thirty-five sentence samples from this population. All samples were collected using a random number table.

The Oxford Concordance Package was used to gather the data for the analysis of vocabulary. I developed several concordances and wordlists both of the combined populations and each of the separate populations.

As a methodological basis for the interpretation of the data I depended for the most part on two texts: The Computation of Style: An Introduction to Statistics for Students of Literature and the Humanities (1982) by Anthony Kenny and Computation into Criticism (1987) by J. F. Burrows. The first I used throughout the analysis; the second specifically for the analysis of vocabulary. Because the purpose of this project was as much to work through the statistical methodology as to attempt to solve the authorship problem, I tried to apply as many of the statistical tests as possible to the data. Although I used many different procedures, I relied most heavily on the chi-square test. Because this particular calculation is so important to my analysis, I will explain it now, and leave the explication of the other tests to the point at which each appears in the analysis.

V

It is not enough that we notice a difference between two features of a text; we must be able to judge whether the

differences we observe are likely to have occurred simply by chance. The chi-square (X^2) test is used to evaluate the probability of the difference between expected and observed frequencies occurring by chance. In this study I used two methods to calculate the necessary chi-square values. For the analysis of Word Frequency, Word Length, Sentence Length and Verbal Segment Length I used the chi-square calculation built into the LitStats program. This gave both individual chi-square values (indicating how each sample compared to or fitted with the other samples being tested) and a table chi-square value (the sum of the individual chi-squares which indicated the likelihood of all the samples occurring in the same population). For the analysis of vocabulary I calculated the chi-square values by hand, using the standard formula

$$X^2 = \frac{\Sigma(O-E)^2}{E}$$

in which O indicates the number of observed occurrences and E the number of expected occurrences. The significance of the resulting X^2 value is gauged by reference to a X^2 table.

A statistical analysis can never guarantee that the observed discrepancy is not due to a strange aberration, but a chi-square test can give us the degree of probability against this being the case. Thus, if a chi-square test gives a value that is significant at $\alpha=0.05$, we know that the likelihood of the observed discrepancy in the data

occurring by chance is 5% or one in twenty. This is considered a statistically "significant" difference. A value that is significant at 0.01 would occur by chance one time out of a hundred; it is considered a "highly significant" difference. Likewise, the probability of a value significant at 0.001 occurring by chance is only one in a thousand or more; such a value is considered to be "very highly significant."

VI

Using the statistics gathered with the LitStats program, I first compared each set of samples with the other samples gathered from the same population (i.e., all the samples from the known-to-be-Lennox population (FQALL) with each other, all the known-to-be-Johnson (RASS) samples with each other, and all the chapter samples (CHPT) with each other) in order to establish whether the samples themselves were consistent.

The results were mixed. Only the chapter was consistent in all five areas. The samples culled from Rasselas were consistent in all areas except Word Repetition. In this area Sample #7 proved to be significantly different from the other samples taken from the same population. The Lennox samples showed the least consistency, with significant differences in two of the five areas. In sentence length Sample #4 differed significantly from the other nine, and the chi-square for the table was

significant at 0.05. The table chi-square for Verbal Segment Length was also found to be significant at 0.05, with two of the Lennox samples (#1, #5) being significantly different from the rest.

These results suggest that there is less consistency in Lennox's writing than in Johnson's. This is probably to be expected. Lennox, as a young person and a beginning writer, would probably be finding her voice at this point in her career; we would expect her to be exploring different modes and styles of writing. Johnson, on the other hand, was fifty years old when he wrote Rasselas. He was experienced and skilled, with a long career in the literary field behind him. We would expect that Johnson would have considerable stylistic control in whatever mode he chose to write.

The fluctuations in Lennox's style suggested by these statistics must temper the interpretation of the other results discussed below. If Lennox's style is in a state of flux at this point in her career, then differences between the body of The Female Quixote and the disputed chapter may be a result of a general instability in her style rather than an indication that she did not write the chapter.

VII

After testing the group of samples (and by extension, the population) for consistency, I compared the samples of writing known to be by Lennox (FQALL) to those known to be by Johnson (RASS). Chi-square tests revealed no significant

difference between FQALL and RASS in Word Length and only minor differences in Word Frequency (Sample #6 in Lennox and Sample #7 in Johnson were significant at α=0.05). The chi-square for the tables in both cases showed no significant difference between the two authors.

The LitStats program automatically collects data on Initial Letter Frequency, which is the number of words in each sample that begin with each letter of the alphabet. Although it is now generally agreed that the distribution of Initial Letters is largely determined by the language used rather than by authorial style, I have included my results because they indicate some interesting differences between the different populations that were tested. Because the Initial Letter Frequency data is unsuitable for chi-square tests, I used the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient to see if there was a linear correlation between the occurrence of initial letters in both authors. Spearman's rho (ρ) proved to be 0.8639, which indicates a significant correlation between Lennox and Johnson. This result will be discussed later in relation to the comparison of the Initial Letter Frequency of both authors to the chapter.

A comparison of sentence length and verbal segment length indicated significant differences in the writing of the two authors. In the Sentence Length comparison, two samples from Lennox were significant to a very high degree (Samples #4 and #5 were significant at α=0.001). Two

samples drawn from Rasselas also differed to a highly significantly degree, with Samples #6 and #8 significant at α=0.01. In addition, the chi-square value for the table was 84.3831, well over the critical value of 59.703 which would make it significant at α=0.001. The differences apparent in sentence length were matched by the Verbal Segment Length results. Two samples from Lennox were significantly different (#2 at α=0.05 and #6 at α=0.01), as were three samples from Johnson (Sample #2 and #8 at α=0.05, and #4 at α=0.01). Again the chi-square for the table was a very highly significant value (α=0.001).

These results suggest that there are very significant differences in sentence length and verbal segment length in Lennox's writing compared to that of Johnson. Any interpretation of the results, however, must be tempered by the problematic nature of punctuation in eighteenth-century publications. Printers had a good deal of license in this period and often altered spelling and punctuation as they saw fit. Since sentence length in the Litstats program is determined by the number of words between periods, exclamation marks or question marks, and verbal segment length is determined by the number of words between any marks of punctuation, all the results based on sentence and verbal segment length must be considered tentative at best.

VIII

After testing the Lennox samples against the Johnson samples, I then compared each against the samples from the disputed chapter. I am, in effect, testing two separate null hypotheses: the first, that there is no difference between the chapter and the rest of The Female Quixote, and the second, that there is no difference between the chapter and comparable fiction by Johnson. The results again were mixed.

I compared Initial Letter Frequency by using the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient. This test compares the rank order of frequency in the initial letters of the ten one-hundred-word samples. A perfect correlation would be indicated as a value of 1.00 (whether positive or negative). As discussed previously, a high correlation (0.8639) was found between the known-Lennox and the known-Johnson samples in this area. When I performed the same calculations between FQALL and the chapter and RASS and the chapter, I found that even higher correlations existed in each case. The Female Quixote and the disputed chapter show a positive correlation of 0.9108 while Rasselas and the chapter have a correlation of +0.9415. Although the chapter has a slightly higher correlation with Johnson than with Lennox, the values that both comparisons yield are so high, this slight distinction is probably meaningless. It is interesting, however, that both Lennox and Johnson

separately correlate to the chapter to a higher degree than they do with each other.

The statistics for the other four areas of analysis were calculated using the chi-square test. In each case a significant difference between one author and the chapter is matched by a similar difference between the other author and the chapter. In the first area, Word Repetition, two FQALL samples (#4 and #6) were significantly different (α=0.05) from the rest of the Female Quixote and chapter samples. When the samples from Rasselas were compared to the chapter, one sample (#7) from Johnson was found to be significantly different at α=0.05. It should be noted, however, that this sample was found to differ significantly from the rest of the Rasselas samples in the earlier internal comparison, suggesting that this result may be due to internal inconsistency rather than a difference between Johnson and the chapter. This contrasts with the results of the Lennox versus the chapter samples, in which each population was found to be internally consistent when tested separately, but to have significant differences when compared to each other.

The Word Length results were similarly mixed. When FQALL was compared to CHPT, two of the chapter samples (#1 and #6) were found to be significantly different at α=0.05. Three chapter samples were also found to be significantly

different when RASS was compared to the chapter (#5, #6, and #10 were all significant at α=0.05).

There is considerable difference in sentence length between the samples taken from The Female Quixote and the samples taken from the chapter. Two of the Lennox samples are significantly different, Sample #5 at 0.05 and Sample #4 at the "very highly significant" level of 0.001. As well, two of the chapter samples (#1 and #3) are also significant at α=0.05. Thus of the eleven samples four are statistically different. The table chi-square is also highly significant at 0.01. In contrast to these values, the comparison between the chapter samples and the samples from Rasselas yielded no significant values at all.

This pattern continues in the Verbal Segment comparison. One chapter sample was found to be significantly different (#2 at 0.05) in the RASS and CHPT comparison, but this was a minor difference compared to those manifested by the FQALL and CHPT comparison. In this test one sample from The Female Quixote (#6) was significant at 0.05, and two samples from the disputed chapter were highly and very highly significant (#3 at α=0.010 and #2 at α=0.001). The table chi-square also indicated a very significant difference with an alpha value of 0.001.

The results of the Sentence Length and Verbal Segment Length chi-square tests suggest a significant similarity (or at least, a lack of difference) between the samples garnered

from Rasselas and those selected from the disputed chapter. Any inferences from this data must be tempered by two considerations: first, one Johnson sample was found to differ significantly from the rest of the Johnson and chapter samples in Verbal Segment Length and, secondly--as discussed previously--sentence and verbal segment length is problematic in eighteenth-century literature.

Keeping these difficulties in mind, however, these chi-square results suggest that the chapter samples are more like the known-Johnson samples than the known-Lennox samples. There are more Lennox and chapter samples found to be significantly different at higher alpha values than in the comparable Johnson versus the chapter tests. In the Female Quixote versus the chapter test there are six samples that are significantly different at 0.05, one sample that differs at 0.01, and two at 0.001. As well the table chi-square values indicate more differences at greater rates of significance in the FQALL versus CHPT comparison than in RASS versus CHPT, including Sentence Length at α=0.01 and Verbal Segment Length at α=0.001. This is in contrast with the RASS versus CHPT comparison in which there were no significant table chi-square values and only five significantly different samples--all at the relatively low level of α=0.05.

IX

In addition to the statistical analysis of Initial Letter Frequency, Word Frequency, Word Length, Sentence Length and Verbal Segment Length, which all centred around the data provided by the Litstats program, I also analyzed the frequency of occurrence of various vocabulary items. I based my analysis on the thirty most frequently used words, using all three populations as the base from which to draw a single wordlist. After omitting all content words, including all nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs and most pronouns--as words most likely to be influenced by context--I used the thirty most frequently used words that remained. These "inert" or function words are the ones most likely to be used without conscious thought and without any influence by subject matter. A significant difference between their use in two texts thus may be an indication of different authorship. The list of thirty non-content words included the, to, of, and, that, a, in, which, not, or, with, from, but, by, for, as, any, if, at, no, so, an, these, when, therefore, those, yet, only, without, and what.

I first compared the use of the top twenty of these words in the disputed text with their use in the dialogue of The Female Quixote and Rasselas. I chose to use the Pearson's Product-Moment Coefficient for this comparison rather than the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient because the Pearson's coefficient takes account of the

difference between the various frequencies in the list of words as well as their ranking order.

Once again the results were inconclusive. The value of the correlation coefficient for the comparison between FQALL and the chapter was +0.9090, indicating a very high correlation. This seemed hopeful, but it was matched by an equally high correlation (+0.9085) between RASS and the chapter, a value within .0005 of the first. There is obviously no significant difference between the two correlations; the non-content vocabulary in both Johnson and Lennox are very highly correlated to the vocabulary of the disputed chapter.

One possible explanation for such a high correlation is that the Pearson's analysis included words that are not used in a distinctive fashion by either Johnson or Lennox. In other words, perhaps the correlation coefficient is being "padded" by words which both authors used at the same frequency. In order to test this hypothesis I needed to know which of the thirty words were used at a significantly different rate in the known-Lennox population from the known-Johnson population. With this data, it would be possible to analyze only the words used distinctively by either Lennox or Johnson against their use in the chapter.

I compared the thirty previously listed words with a manually computed chi-square test. Since function words should theoretically occur at the same rate across the texts

being compared, I added the actual rate of occurrence in FQALL and RASS, placed this total proportionately against the total number of words, and then determined the expected number of occurrences for each population. After I had calculated the expected value I used the chi-square test to see if the observed rate of occurrence was significantly different. I used Yate's correction throughout the computations--subtracting an extra 0.05 from the numerator--since the calculated expected values could be fractional values, while the observed values were always discrete.

To illustrate with an example: the word from occurs 55 times in the dialogue taken from The Female Quixote and 97 times in the dialogue taken from Rasselas for a total of 152 in both populations. The observed values are 55 and 97. Since, under a hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the authors, from would be expected to occur as often in Lennox's writing as in Johnson's, we add the number of words in the populations of both (for example, 17284 in FQALL and 17657 in RASS) for 34941 words in total, multiply this number by the total observed occurrence of the word (152 x 34941), and divide the total by the number of words in FQALL (17284) to get the expected number of occurrences in Lennox's population (75). We then repeat the process using the total number of words in RASS, and compute an expected value for that population of 77. We can then use the previously discussed chi-square formula to determine

if there is a significant difference between the expected use of from by each author and the actual observed use. The formula below has been adjusted with Yate's correction:

$$X^2 = \frac{(|O-E|-0.05)^2}{E}$$

Substituting in the data on from in Lennox, we have

$$X^2 = \frac{(|55-75|-0.05)^2}{75}$$

$$X^2 = 5.07.$$

Since the critical value at $\alpha=0.05$ is 3.841 (taken from the X^2 tables), we can conclude that there is a significant difference in the frequency of Lennox's use of the word from as compared to Johnson. After repeating the process with the data from Rasselas, we calculate a X^2 value of 4.9383, also significant at $\alpha=0.05$.

After repeating this set of calculations with the remaining twenty-nine words, I found sixteen of the thirty words to be used at significantly different rates. Of these, the majority were significant at well over the 0.05 level. Six words (the, a, which, or, for, and so) were very highly significant at $\alpha=0.001$. while four others (of, and, as, and these) were highly significant at $\alpha=0.01$. The remaining five words (from, by, any, if, an, and without) were significant at $\alpha=0.05$.

I then did two tests with these sixteen words. I first recalculated the Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation, using

only the words found to distinguish Lennox from Johnson. Although both correlation coefficients were still high, there was a greater difference between them. The known-Lennox compared to the disputed chapter had a coefficient value of +0.8842, while the known-Johnson compared to the chapter had a value of +0.9306. This suggests that vocabulary usage in the disputed chapter corresponds more closely to Johnson's known usage than Lennox's. A difference of 0.0464, however, is of questionable significance.

Because these sixteen words are used at significantly different rates in the writing of Lennox and Johnson, if the chapter is the product of one or the other, it seems reasonable to predict that the rate of usage of these words should conform to the rate in either of the authors' known texts. We would therefore expect that in one case--whether it be in the dialogue from The Female Quixote or the dialogue from Rasselas--there would be no significant difference; this result should be matched with a significant difference in the other comparison.

To test this hypothesis I computed the necessary chi-squares, comparing first the frequency of the word in the chapter versus its frequency in the Lennox population and then repeating the process with the Johnson population. The results of this series of tests are tabulated below. The numbers in bold indicate significant differences. As

indicated in the Legend below Table 1, the plus signs that precede the numbers in bold indicate the level of significance. What is immediately striking is the even distribution of significant values. Of the sixteen words tested, six are used at significantly different rates in the chapter as compared to the known-Lennox population. This statistic is almost identical to the results of the Johnson-chapter comparison, in which seven words were found to be used at significantly different rates.

Table 1: X^2 Values for Significant Vocabulary

WORD	CHAPTER AND FQALL		CHAPTER AND RASS	
	Chapter	Lennox	Chapter	Johnson
1. the	2.8583	0.8133	++ 6.7822	1.8847
2. of	0.0721	0.0204	3.4538	3.4938
3. and	0.1523	0.0435	++ 7.3021	2.0311
4. a	1.1142	0.3178	+ 4.3682	1.2013
5. which	+++15.4083	+ 4.4024	0.6576	0.1822
6. or	+++30.5326	++ 8.8892	2.8269	0.7819
7. from	+++23.0114	++10.5469	+ 5.8790	1.6419
8. by	0.0078	0.0023	2.9389	0.8214
9. for	+ 8.9415	2.5165	0.0804	0.0227
10. as	+ 4.6731	1.3207	0.0096	0.0027
11. any	1.0658	0.2935	++ 8.4808	2.3967
12. if	0.0114	0.0033	3.7500	1.0613
13. so	1.9397	0.5625	+ 6.0037	0.0037
14. an	0.0833	0.0363	+ 6.5682	1.8526
15. these	2.3269	0.6722	+++18.8929	+ 5.5104
16. without	++ 9.0313	2.6759	0.0147	0.0041

Legend:

+ significant (α=0.05)
++ highly significant (α=0.01)
+++ very highly significant (α=0.001)

Of the fourteen words that had not proven to be used at significantly different rates in Lennox and Johnson, four were used in a significantly different rate in the chapter:

Table IV-2: X^2 Values for Non-significant Vocabulary

WORD	CHAPTER AND FQALL		CHAPTER AND RASS	
	CHAPTER	LENNOX	CHAPTER	RASS
to	1.0414	0.2568	++7.2403	2.0184
that	+4.1952	1.3422	0.8811	0.2466
therefore	++9.0250	3.4712	++8.0278	2.1250
only	+6.2500	1.7578	+4.2250	1.1736

The remaining ten words showed no significant differences at all.

The dissimilarity in the use of "inert" vocabulary in the chapter and both the Lennox population and the Johnson population is striking. Nine of the twenty words tested differed significantly in the chapter compared to the Lennox population--three at extremely high alpha levels. When these same twenty words were compared between the chapter and Johnson populations, eleven words differed significantly.

Obviously, these results support neither null hypothesis. They are, however, the type of results one would expect to get if neither Lennox nor Johnson wrote the chapter. They also may indicate a collaborative effort between Lennox and Johnson.

X

All of the statistical procedures detailed above have been done with the assumption that either Lennox or Johnson

wrote the chapter. But it is possible that they both worked on the chapter, and there are a number of ways they could have done so. Either Lennox or Johnson could have written the chapter, and had the other revise it, or they could have sat down and written the whole thing together. The fruits of such a joint effort could generate the kind of statistical data that has been discussed above; a true collaboration would surely result in a text that, by being marked by the styles of two writers, is in the style of neither.

To my knowledge, there is no statistical method presently available that can identify true collaborations--works written by two or more authors together. It is possible, however, in this particular case that Johnson and Lennox each wrote half of the chapter, and this theory is amenable to statistical analysis. This possibility was first suggested by Robert Hay Carnie. In the first edition of The Female Quixote the disputed chapter begins on O6r and ends on P5v. Carnie noted that the P gathering, which begins on page 313, has more lines to the page and lengthier paragraphs, and suggested that this gathering may be a cancel, perhaps set up in different publishing houses. He argued that Johnson wrote only the part of the chapter in the P gathering.

XI

In order to test Professor Carnie's theory, I did a series of tests with the two halves of the chapter. The first part of the chapter, up to the P gathering, was 2713 words after the narrative portions were removed. This portion of the chapter, which is the segment Carnie argues was written by Lennox, I labelled Segment A. The second section, 2317 words beginning on page 313 of the first edition, I labelled Segment B.

The first step was to see if there was a significant difference between the two chapter segments. Because of the smallness of the chapter halves, I compared the mean values from each segment in a series of z-tests. As in the chi-square test, the first step of a z-test is to formulate a null hypothesis; in this case that there is no difference between the means in the two chapter segments. The z value or standardized normal deviate is calculated by dividing the observed difference by the Standard Error (SE) of the difference. The observed difference between the means is calculated by subtracting one of the population means (in this case one of the chapter segment means) from the other. The null hypothesis is rejected if the z value is above the established critical value (α). The SE of the difference between the two means with the following formula:

$$SEM = \sqrt{\left(\frac{s_1}{n_1} + \frac{s_2}{n_2}\right)}$$

Where s_1 is the Standard Deviation of the first population, s_2 is the Standard Deviation of the second population, and n_1 and n_2 are the number of items in each population being compared (for example, number of sentences when sentence length is compared). The significance of the z-score is obtained by reference to a z-score table.

The data from which I obtained the following results were gathered using the LitStats program.

Table IV-3: Comparison of Chapter Segments A and B

	Chapter Segment A	Chapter Segment B	Results of z-test
Word Frequency			NO SIG. DIFF.
Mean frequency	3.1077	2.8452	
S.D.	25.8171	22.9536	
Word Length			NO SIG. DIFF.
Mean Word Length	4.6635	4.6209	
S.D.	2.5375	2.5579	
Sentence Length			HIGHLY SIG. DIFF. Z=3.1989
Mean Sentence L.	26.0865	36.1875	
S.D.	16.3553	21.7598	
Verbal Seg. L.			NO SIG. DIFF.
Mean V.S.L.	6.7995	7.5934	
S.D.	4.7458	4.6685	

The z-value for Sentence Length is significant at an α value of 0.0007. The results of Sentence Length suggest that it is very unlikely that both segments of the chapter are from the same population.[1]

After testing the two chapter segments against each other, I then compared them against the Female Quixote and Rasselas populations, using the same method I had applied previously to the full chapter comparisons. One thirty-five sentence sample from each of the chapter segments was selected. I could only select one random sample because of the small size of the chapter segments. I then did a series of chi-square tests using the LitStats program, comparing each chapter segment to the eight samples taken from each of the Rasselas and Female Quixote populations.

In the comparison between Sentence Length in the samples of Chapter Segment A and The Female Quixote, two of the Lennox samples were found to differ significantly (#4 at 0.01 and #5 and 0.05). The Chapter Segment sample also differed at 0.01 and the entire table had a value that was significant at 0.05. In the Chapter Segment B and Female Quixote comparison, sentence length was only found to differ significantly (at 0.01) in Lennox Sample #4. There was no significant difference in the Chapter Segment B sample and the table chi-square was not significant.

In the comparison between Sentence Length in the Rasselas samples and both chapter segment A and B there were no significant differences at all; the table chi-square values were also insignificant.

Again, as in the comparison between the full chapter and the samples from texts known to be by Lennox and Johnson, the Verbal Segment Length results reinforce those of Sentence Length. In the chi-square test of the samples from Chapter Segment A and the samples from The Female Quixote two of the Lennox samples were found to be significantly different (#1 and #5 at 0.05). The table chi-square value was also significant at 0.05. In the comparison of Chapter Segment B to Lennox none of the Lennox samples were significantly different, but both the chapter sample and the table chi-square value were significant at 0.001. As in the Sentence Length test, there were no significant differences in the comparison of the known-Johnson samples to either Segment A or B.

XII

The comparison of vocabulary between each chapter segment and the FOALL and RASS populations gave very similar results as the comparison of the full chapter to these populations.

Table IV-4: Comparison of Vocabulary in Chapter Segments and *The Female Quixote* Population

	Chpt Seg A and FQALL		Chpt Seg B and FQALL	
Word	Segment A	FQALL	Segment B	FQALL
1. the	---	---	---	---
2. of	---	---	---	---
3. which	+++14.0167	---	++7.5208	---
4. or	+++11.0250	---	++7.2250	+ 4.8204
5. and	---	---	---	---
6. a	---	---	---	---
7. from	+++19.1136	---	+++12.2500	---
8. for	+ 5.5804	---	+ 4.5938	---
9. as	+ 6.0113	---	---	---
10. any	---	---	---	---

Table IV-5: Comparison of Vocabulary in Chapter Segments and the *Rasselas* Population

	Chpt Seg A and *Rasselas*		Chpt Seg B and *Rasselas*	
Word	Segment A	RASS	Segment B	RASS
1. the	+4.4730	---	+4.4795	---
2. of	+4.5201	---	---	---
3. which	---	---	---	---
4. or	---	---	+6.1250	---
5. and	++7.7170	---	---	---
6. a	---	---	+5.0865	---
7. from	+4.7500	---	---	---
8. from	---	---	---	---
9. as	---	---	---	---
10. any	++8.0357	---	---	---

It is clear from the above table that the tested words were used at significantly different rates in both segments as compared to the Rasselas and The Female Quixote populations. Except in two cases (or and from), the words that were significant compared to the Lennox population, were insignificant compared to Johnson and vice versa.

XIII

In order to draw any conclusions from the statistical results reported above, one must return to the original null hypotheses of this study:

H_o1: there is no difference between the chapter and the known-Johnson population.

H_o2: there is no difference between the chapter and the known-Lennox population.

The statistics discussed above suggest that significant differences exist between the chapter and Johnson's known writing. There are significant differences in the areas of Word Repetition, Word Length, Verbal Segment Length and Vocabulary Usage. Even if the null hypothesis is adjusted to test the theory that Johnson only wrote half of the chapter, it must still be rejected because of the significant differences in the use of vocabulary in both segments of the chapter compared to Johnson.

The same arguments can be made about the second null hypothesis. There are significant differences between the chapter and Lennox's known work; indeed, the differences are

not infrequently more in number and at a higher rate of significance than in the case of the Johnson/Chapter comparison. Interestingly enough, there are almost equal differences between the Lennox and Johnson populations and the chapter in every area except Sentence and Verbal Segment Length. In these data the chapter appears to be more similar to Johnson than Lennox, but these two stylistic features are the most problematic of the study.

In the opening paragraph of this analysis I discussed four logical possibilities for the authorship of this chapter. The rejection of the first null hypothesis challenges the assumption that Johnson wrote the entire chapter. The rejection of the second null hypothesis is an equal challenge of Lennox's authorship of the chapter. We are thus left with two possibilities: either neither Lennox nor Johnson wrote the chapter, or they wrote it together. External evidence supports the latter possibility; if we assume that no third party is involved, the rejection of the two null hypotheses makes a collaborative effort the most likely possibility.

Notes

1. Again, one must note that the difference in Sentence and Verbal Segment Length may be due to differences in compositors. It is possible that different compositors worked on the two gatherings, and that one of them tended to set shorter sentences. A change in compositor is probably more likely to occur at the end of a gathering; whether or not the probability of change increased for a cancel is difficult to determine.

CONCLUSION

The results of the statistical analysis detailed above are maddeningly contradictory. At the very least, these data indicate that this authorship question is not as simple as it has traditionally been assumed.

The primary evidence in this dispute has generally been based on a subjective assessment of the style of the chapter. The determination of authorship by subjective analysis, however, can only work if there are no dissenting voices. In the case of the disputed chapter, not all critics are convinced that it sounds like Johnson; some believe, as Gae Brack does, that the chapter sounds like Lennox trying to write in the style of Johnson. My statistical analysis has suggested that in several basic features there are significant differences between the style of the chapter and the style of Johnson's known fictional writing.

The relevance of the external evidence mustered in support of Reverend Mitford's attribution has also been questioned by dissenting critics. Much of this evidence seems merely to prove that Lennox and Johnson were good friends--hardly a revelation, and hardly proof that he wrote this specific text.

Part of the difficulty appears to be that, despite its original popularity and success, until relatively recently The Female Quixote and its author were considered

interesting only because of their association with Samuel Johnson. Charlotte Lennox has thus been fixed in the literary schema strictly in relation to Johnson. This is clearly not an objective perspective, but, once established, it is one that is very difficult to change. The process becomes both self-perpetuating and self-justifying. Critics hypothesize about the association between Lennox and Johnson, and then use their speculations as evidence for further hypotheses. Contrary evidence is absorbed into the theory or rejected (is there a section in the chapter that does not sound like Johnson? it must be an insertion by Lennox). Once Johnson's involvement is assumed, the evidence is discovered.

This is not to say that there is not a case to be made for Johnson's involvement in this particular text. I think there are indications that Johnson assisted Lennox, but that assistance may have taken other forms than singlehandedly writing the chapter. Johnson may have only discussed the chapter with Lennox, or revised her first draft. Perhaps they wrote the chapter jointly. There are similarities between the style of the chapter and Johnson's writing, but perhaps these are similarities of time and place--it may be that these are the common features of eighteenth-century style. Or it may be that these similarities simply indicate that Lennox used Johnson as a model for her character and the Rambler essays as a model for her writing.

Some of these possibilities deserve further study. The chapter could be compared to similar eighteenth-century texts, for example, to determine whether or not the similarities between it and Johnson's writing are any greater than between the chapter and the work of an author completely unassociated with the work. Further work could also be done in the area of collaboration. A comparison of the data from a known collaboration against the above chapter data might prove to be interesting. A similar scattering of data would suggest that this text too was a collaboration.

In the absence of conclusive evidence that Johnson wrote the chapter, and lacking positive evidence that this was either a collaboration or that there was a third person involved, the chapter must, by default, be considered to have been written by Lennox. Perhaps the most telling bit of evidence is the one that is never discussed: not one of Lennox's or Johnson's contemporaries suggested that anyone else wrote the chapter. The "obvious" and "unmistakable" fact that the chapter was written by Johnson went unnoticed for almost a hundred years, despite the fact that The Female Quixote was a very popular novel and Johnson's work was widely read.

WORKS CONSULTED

Bate, Walter Jackson. The Achievement of Samuel Johnson. New York: Oxford UP, 1955.

---. Samuel Johnson. New York: Harcourt, 1975.

Bloom, Edward A. Samuel Johnson in Grub Street. Providence, Rhode Island: Brown UP, 1957.

Boswell, James. Boswell's Life of Johnson. Ed. George Birkbeck Hill. Revised by L.F. Powell. 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1934.

Brack, Gae Annette. "Samuel Johnson and Four Literary Women." Diss. Arizona State U, 1979.

Brack, O M, Jr. and Robert E. Kelley, eds. The Early Biographies of Samuel Johnson. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1974.

Burney, Frances. The Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay. London: Vizetelly, 1890.

Burrows, J. F. Computation Into Criticism: A Study of Jane Austen's Novels and an Experiment in Method. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.

Clifford, James L. Dictionary Johnson: Samuel Johnson's Middle Years. New York: McGraw, 1979.

---. Young Samuel Johnson. London: William Heinemann, 1955.

Clifford, James L., and Donald J. Greene. Samuel Johnson: A Survey and Bibliography of Critical Studies. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1970.

Doody, Margaret Anne. Introduction. The Female Quixote; or, The Adventures of Arabella. By Charlotte Lennox. Ed. Margaret Dalziel. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989. xi-xxxii.

Edinger, William. Samuel Johnson and Poetic Style. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1977.

Gray, James. "Dr. Johnson, Charlotte Lennox, and the Englishing of Father Brumoy." Modern Philology 83 (1985): 142-150.

Grundy, Isobel, ed. Samuel Johnson: New Critical Essays. London: Vision, 1984.

---. Samuel Johnson and the Scale of Greatness. Leicester: Leicester UP, 1986.

---. "Samuel Johnson as Patron of Women." The Age of Johnson. 1 (1987): 59-77.

[Harrison, James]. "The Life of Dr. Samuel Johnson." Brack and Kelley 247-290.

Hawkins, John. The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.. 1787. New York: Garland, 1974.

Hazen, Allen T. Samuel Johnson's Prefaces and Dedications. New Haven: Yale UP, 1937.

Hill, George Birkbeck, ed. Johnsonion Miscellanies. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1897.

Hockey, Susan, and Jeremy Marten. Oxford Concordance Package. Computer software. Oxford UP, 1988.

Isles, Duncan E. "Johnson and Charlotte Lennox." The New Rambler. June. 1967: 34-48.

---. "The Lennox Collection." Harvard Library Bulletin 18 (1970): 317-44, 19 (1971): 36-40, 165-86, 416-35.

---. "Johnson, Richardson, and The Female Quixote." The Female Quixote; or, The Adventures of Arabella. By Charlotte Lennox. Ed. Margaret Dalziel. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989. 419-28.

Johnson, Samuel. The Rambler. Ed. W. J. Bate and Albrecht B. Strauss. Vols. 3-5 of The Works of Samuel Johnson. New Haven, Conn.: Yale UP, 1969.

---. A Dictionary of the English Language. 2 vols. London, 1755. New York: Ams P., 1967.

---. Rasselas, Poems, and Selected Prose. Ed. Bertrand H. Bronson. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, 1971.

---. The Letters of Samuel Johnson. Ed. R. W. Chapman. Oxford: Clarendon, 1952.

Kaminski, Thomas. The Early Career of Samuel Johnson. New York: Oxford UP, 1987.

Kenny, Anthony. The Computation of Style: An Introduction to Statistics for Students of Literature and Humanities. Oxford: Pergamon, 1982.

Langbauer, Laurie. "Romance Revised: Charlotte Lennox's The Female Quixote." Novel 18 (1984): 29-49.

Lennox, Charlotte. The Life of Harriot Stuart: Written by Herself. London: Payne, 1751.

---. The Female Quixote; or, The Adventures of Arabella. 1752. Ed. Margaret Dalziel. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1970 [rpr. 1989].

---. Henrietta. 2nd ed. London: Millar, 1861.

"Lennox, Charlotte." National Cyclopedia of American Biography. New York: White, 1892.

MacCarthy, B. G. The Later Women Novelists 1744-1818. Dublin: Cork UP, 1947.

McIntosh, Carey. The Choice of Life: Samuel Johnson and the World of Fiction. New Haven: Yale UP, 1973.

---. Common and Courtly Language: The Stylistics of Social Class in 18th-Century English Literature. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1986.

Maynadier, Gustavus Howard. The First American Novelist? Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1940.

"Memories of Mrs Lenox, the celebrated Author of the Female Quixotte, and other works." The Edinburgh Weekly Magazine 9 Oct. 1783: 33-36.

Milic, Louis T. Style and Stylistics: An Analytical Bibliography. New York: Free, 1967.

Mitford, John. "Dr. Johnson's Literary Intercourse with Mrs. Lennox." Gentleman's Magazine Aug. 1843: 132.

---. "Chapter by Dr. Johnson in 'The Female Quixote.'" Gentleman's Magazine Jan. 1844: 41-48.

Orr, Leonard. "Johnson and the Penultimate Chapter of Lennox's The Female Quixote." Enlightenment Essays 8 (1977): 64-74.

Paulson, Ronald. Satire and the Novel in Eighteenth-Century England. New Haven: Yale UP, 1967.

Read, Allen Walker. "The Contemporary Quotations in Johnson's Dictionary." English Literary History 2 (1935): 246-251.

Reimer, Stephen R. LitStats. Vers. 1.62. Computer Software. 1989.

Reynolds, Myra. The Learned Lady in England, 1650-1760. Boston: Houghton, 1920.

Ross, Deborah. "Mirror, Mirror: The Didactic Dilemma of The Female Quixote." Studies in English Literature 1500-1900. 27 (1987): 455-73.

Sabor, Peter. "Richardson's Advice to Novelists." Transactions of the Samuel Johnson Society of the Northwest. 13 (1982): 60-71.

Séjourné, Philippe. The Mystery of Charlotte Lennox: First Novelist of Colonial America (1727?-1804). Publications des Annales de la Faculté des Lettres ns 62. Aix-en-Provence: Faculté des Lettres, 1967.

Sherbo, Arthur. "The Uses and Abuses of Internal Evidence." Evidence for Authorship: Essays on Problems of Attribution. Ed. David V. Erdman and Ephim G. Fogel. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1966. 6-24.

Small, Miriam Rossiter. Charlotte Ramsay Lennox: An Eighteenth Century Lady of Letters. 1935. N.p.: Archon, 1969.

Spacks, Patricia Meyer. "The Subtle Sophistry of Desire: Dr. Johnson and The Female Quixote." Modern Philology 85 (1988): 532-542.

Vesterman, William. The Stylistic Life of Samuel Johnson. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1977.

Walpole, Horace. Letters of Horace Walpole. Ed. Mrs. Paget Toynbee. 16 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1903.

Warren, Leland E. "Of the Conversation of Women: The Female Quixote and the Dream of Perfection." Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture 11 (1981): 369-70.

Wilson, Mona. These Were Muses. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1924.

Wimsatt, W.K., Jr. Philosophic Words: A Study of Style and Meaning in the Rambler and Dictionary of Samuel Johnson. 1948. N.p.: Archon, 1968.

---. The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson. 1941. Hamden, Conn.: Archon, 1972.

Wright, J.D. (ed.) "Some Unpublished Letters To and From Dr. Johnson." Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 16 (1932): 57.